

2011 REALIGNMENT

This section provides high-level summaries of the realigned programs, estimated caseloads for programs or services, histories of rate changes, links to other related information in the 2013 May Revision binder and links to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) website.

SUMMARY OF 2011 REALIGNMENT:

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12, state funding for the following programs was realigned to the counties: Adoptions Assistance Program (AAP); Agency Adoptions Program; Foster Care (FC); Child Welfare Services (CWS); Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment (CAPIT) Program and Adult Protective Services (APS).

Authorizing legislation included Assembly Bill (AB) 118 (Chapter 40, Statutes of 2011) and ABX1 16 (Chapter 13, First Extraordinary Session, Statutes of 2011), which also established the Local Revenue Fund 2011 (LRF). Senate Bill (SB) 1020 (Chapter 40, Statutes of 2012) established the Support Services Account by revising the provisions of AB 118 and ABX1 16. Specified tax revenues are now redirected to the counties' LRF Protective Services Subaccount of the Support Services Account on an ongoing basis.

EXPENDITURE DATA AND DESCRIPTIONS FOR REALIGNED PROGRAMS:

SB 1013 (Chapter 35, Statutes of 2012) required CDSS to annually report to the appropriate fiscal and policy committees of the Legislature, and publicly post on the CDSS Internet website, a summary of outcome and expenditure data that allows for monitoring of changes over time that may have occurred as a result of the 2011 Realignment of the child welfare system. The report can be found on the CDSS website: <http://www.cdss.ca.gov/cdssweb/PG2800.htm>

The ESTIMATE METHODOLOGIES section in the 2013 May Revision binder under "Realigned Programs" pages 121-125 provide the details of FY 2011-12 base year costs for the 2011 Realignment funding and also reflect updated assumptions for the federal, county and reimbursement funding.

Descriptions for each of the realigned premises from the 2011 May Revision are available at: <http://www.cdss.ca.gov/cdssweb/entres/pdf/2011MayRevisionRealignedPremises.pdf>. These premises provide full descriptions, methodologies and funding for the FY 2011-12 realigned programs.

SUMMARY OF REALIGNED PROGRAMS:

ADOPTIONS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND FOSTER CARE PROGRAM

The following two tables provide a history of AAP and FC rates over a select number of years and the projected caseload by program type for the 2011 May Revision base year, FY 2012-13, and FY 2013-14. Summary program descriptions follow the tables.

FOSTER CARE BUDGETED AVERAGE GRANT BY PLACEMENT TYPE

The Foster Family Home (FFH), Foster Family Agency (FFA), Group Home (GH) and AAP grants reflect the combined average federal and nonfederal amounts

	Fiscal Years						
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11*	2011-12**	2012-13***	2013-14
FFH	\$689.37	\$688.33	\$729.59	\$753.96	\$905.40	\$932.03	\$956.72
FFA	1,668.78	1,792.70	1,778.74	1,789.32	1,642.66	2,002.94	2,056.02
GH	4,896.21	5,174.68	5,380.43	7,103.14	7,259.46	7,737.22	7,933.64
AAP	769.07	777.85	780.14	834.31	847.89	902.02	925.92

* The GH rate increased overall by 32 percent beginning December 14, 2009, with CNI increases every July thereafter.

** The basic rate component of the FFH rate increased by 31 percent beginning May 1, 2011, with CNI increases every July thereafter.

** The basic rate component for prospective AAP cases increased by 31 percent beginning May 1, 2011, with CNI increases every July thereafter for prospective and current AAP cases.

*** The basic rate component of the FFA rate increased by 31 percent beginning July 1, 2012, with CNI increases every July thereafter.

FOSTER CARE CASELOAD FORECAST

	Base Year	2013 May Forecast			
	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	Change (BY – CY)	
		Current	Budget		
		Year (CY)	Year (BY)	Caseload	%
Total FC Caseload	45,857	43,930	41,534	-2,396	-5.5%
FFH	23,446	24,437	23,849	-588	-2.4%
FFA	15,378	13,037	11,761	-1,276	-9.8%
GH	7,033	6,456	5,924	-532	-8.2%
AAP	86,393	85,339	86,411	1,072	1.3%

Caseload trends for AAP and FC are shown under the caseload tabs on pages 33-34 and pages 23-30 respectively of the 2013 May Revision binder.

ADOPTIONS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Authority: Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 16115 through 16123.

An overview of the AAP program is provided on pages 1-2 under the PROGRAM OVERVIEWS tab and the History of Major Changes can be found on pages 1-2 under the REFERENCE DOCUMENTS tab in the 2013 May Revision binder.

The AAP funding reflects the basic cost of providing financial support to families adopting a child with special needs. The AAP benefit is limited to the age-related FFH basic rate for which the child would otherwise be eligible. Additionally, the grant cost for a child entering the AAP on or after January 1, 2010, is frozen at the level provided at entry, i.e., no increases are provided based on an increase in age.

AGENCY ADOPTIONS PROGRAM

The Adoptions Program is comprised of both Agency (Relinquishment) and Independent Adoptions Programs, but only Agency Adoptions were realigned. Agency Adoptions funding is provided for adoption placements through a licensed adoption agency for children who have been relinquished by their parent(s) and/or the parental rights have been terminated by a court action due to abuse or neglect.

Authority: W&IC section 16100 through 16106.

An overview of the Agency Adoptions Program is provided on pages 3-4 under the PROGRAM OVERVIEWS tab and the History of Major Changes can be found on pages 3-4 under the REFERENCE DOCUMENTS tab in the 2013 May Revision binder.

FOSTER CARE PROGRAM

An overview of the FC program is provided on pages 19-20 under the PROGRAM OVERVIEWS tab and the History of Major Changes can be found on pages 33-44 under the REFERENCE DOCUMENTS tab in the 2013 May Revision binder.

Summary descriptions of the types of FC placements are shown below.

Estimated realignment expenditures for FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14 by funding source are shown in the premise write up, "Realigned Programs", on pages 121-125 of ESTIMATE METHODOLOGIES in the 2013 May Revision binder. Federal and nonfederal average grant computations utilize caseload and expenditure data reported by the counties on the CA 237 FC Report.

Foster Family Home

- Authority: W&IC section 11461.
- Provide 24-hour care and supervision in a family environment for children who cannot live in their own homes.
- Capacity of six or less.
- Licensed by the state or county community care licensing agencies or are approved homes of relatives or nonrelated legal guardians.
- Reimbursement rates range from \$640 to \$799 per month based on the age of the child in placement. A specialized care increment may be paid to a family home in addition to the basic rate on behalf of a federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children – Foster Care (AFDC-FC) child requiring specialized care because of health and/or behavioral problems. A county clothing allowance may also be paid by counties in addition to the basic rate on behalf of an AFDC-FC eligible child.

Foster Family Agency

- Authority: W&IC sections 11463 and 18358.3.
- Nonprofit agencies licensed to recruit, certify, train and support foster parents for children needing placement.
- Primarily serve children who would otherwise require Group Home (GH) care.
- The FFA treatment rates are established by using a basic rate similar to the FFH rate plus a set increment for the special needs of the child, an increment for social work activities and a percentage for administration, recruitment and training. Reimbursement rates range from \$1,697 to \$1,956 per month based on the age of the child in placement. Reimbursement rates for Intensive Treatment Foster Care Program range from \$4,034 to \$5,581 per month based on the level of services provided to the child.

Group Homes

- Authority: W&IC section 11462.
- Private nonprofit non-detention facilities that provide services in a group setting to children in need of care and supervision.
- This is the most restrictive out-of-home placement for children in FC, providing an option for children with significant emotional or behavioral problems who would otherwise require more restrictive environments.
- Reimbursement rates range from \$2,223 to \$9,419 per month based on the rate classification level, 1-14.

CHILD WELFARE SERVICES PROGRAMCWS CASELOAD FORECAST

The caseload components of the CWS program are: Emergency Response (ER), Emergency Response Assessment (ERA), Family Maintenance (FM), Family Reunification (FR) and Permanent Placement (PP) components of the CWS program. Caseload trends are shown on pages 15-22 of CASELOAD in the 2013 May Revision binder.

	<u>Base Year</u>	<u>2013 May Forecast</u>			
	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	Change (BY – CY)	
		(CY)	(BY)	Caseload	%
Total CWS Caseload	136,433	137,325	136,446	-879	0.64%
ER	39,896	39,828	40,233	405	1.02%
ERA	16,162	18,115	18,468	353	1.95%
FM	23,257	24,528	24,394	-134	-0.55%
FR	21,644	21,566	21,896	330	1.53%
PP	35,474	33,288	31,454	-1,834	-5.51%

Authority: W&IC section 16500 and 11461(e)(4)(B).

An overview of the CWS programs is provided on pages 15-16 under the PROGRAM OVERVIEWS tab and the History of Major Changes can be found on pages 33-44 under the REFERENCE DOCUMENTS tab in the 2013 May Revision binder.
The CWS delivered primarily through the counties are listed below.

Emergency Response

The ER services consist of a response system that provides in-person response, when required, to reports of child abuse, neglect or exploitation for the purpose of investigation and to determine the necessity for providing initial intake services and crisis intervention to maintain the child safely in his/her home or to protect the safety of the child.

Emergency Response Assessment

The ERA is the initial intake service provided in response to reported allegations of child abuse, neglect or exploitation that is determined, based upon an evaluation of risk, to be inappropriate for an in-person investigation.

Family Maintenance

The FM is designed to provide time-limited protective services to prevent or remedy neglect, abuse or exploitation for the purpose of preventing separation of children from their families. The Child Welfare Departments (CWDs) are responsible for determining the specific service needs of the child and family aimed at sustaining the child from the home.

Family Reunification

The FR is designed to provide time-limited protective services to prevent or remedy neglect, abuse or exploitation when the child cannot safely remain at home. The CWDs are responsible for determining the specific service needs of the child and/or family aimed at reunifying the child with the family.

Permanent Placement

The PP is designed to provide an alternative permanent family structure for children who because of abuse, neglect or exploitation cannot safely remain at home and who are unlikely to ever return home. The CWDs are responsible for determining the appropriate permanent goal for the child and facilitating the implementation of that goal. These goals are defined as guardianship, adoption or long-term placement.

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION, INTERVENTION AND TREATMENT PROGRAM

Authority: W&IC sections 18960 through 18965.

The purpose of the federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-247) and subsequent amendments was to provide funding to the states in a basic state grant that targets statewide improvements in areas such as: expanding risk and safety assessments; assessing families' needs for services; and strengthening linkages between child welfare services, public health, mental health, and developmental disabilities agencies to screen children ages 0-5 years who have come to the attention of child protective services and are in need of early intervention services. Funds are also used to enhance the capacity of family resource centers and family support programs to provide services to strengthen families, and to provide training on the assessment and developmental interventions for high-risk, medically

fragile newborns. The Act consists of two parts: Title 1, General Program and Title 2, the Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) Program.

The CAPIT program was originally established by AB 1733 (Chapter 1398, Statutes of 1982) to promote prevention and intervention services for children at risk of abuse and/or neglect. These funds are also used to fulfill federal CBCAP grant matching and leveraging requirements. With the passage of SB 1013 (Chapter 35, Statutes of 2012) that implemented the 2011 Realignment, counties are no longer required to contract for services and may now use the realigned CAPIT funds in-house to provide direct services (such as home visiting, counseling, etc.) to the target population as long as federal match requirements continue to be met.

ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES

Authority: W&IC section 13004 through 13007 as related to the County Services Block Grant; commencing with W&IC section 15600 as related to the Elder Abuse and Dependent Adult Civil Protection and APS.

The APS program provides assistance to elderly and dependent adults who are functionally impaired, unable to meet their own needs, and who are victims of abuse, neglect or exploitation. SB 2199 (Chapter 946, Statutes of 1998), established a statewide mandated APS program and provided funds for expanded APS activities. It required the reporting of elder dependent adult abuse on a 24-hour emergency response basis, completing investigation and needs assessments and providing case management services. SB 2199 also required the provision of necessary tangible resources such as food, emergency shelter care, in-home protection, transportation and the use of multidisciplinary teams.

2011 Realigned Premises Table of Contents

Extend Foster Care, Kin-GAP, AAP Benefits (AB 12).....	1
FFH Rate Increase.....	17
Foster Family Home-Basic Costs	23
Group Home-Basic Costs	27
Foster Family Agency-Basic Costs.....	31
Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED) Children Basic Costs	35
Shift SED Responsibility to CDE (Prop 98)	37
Supplemental Clothing Allowance	39
FFH Rate Increase Supplemental Clothing Allowance Impact.....	17
TANF Title XX Foster Care Funding.....	41
TANF Title XX Foster Care-Impact of GH Rate Increase	41
FFH Rate Increase - Tribal Agreement Impact.....	17
Supportive Transitional Emancipation Program (STEP).....	45
Emergency Assistance Program - Foster Care Welfare	47
Expansion of Eligibility for ITFC Program (SB 1380)	49
Foster Care and AAP Overpayments	51
Multi Treatment Foster Care Program Rates.....	53
Educational Stability (P.L. 110-351)	55
Group Home and SED Rate Increase	59
Residentially Based Services (AB 1453)	63
Federal Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program (AB 12) (Fed-GAP Basic).....	67
Reassessment Eligibility Relief (AB 1905).....	71
FFH Rate Increase - FFH Impact	17
FFH Rate Increase - NRLG Impact	17
FFH Rate Increase - Fed-GAP Impact	17
Adoption Assistance Program - Basic Costs	75
AAP De-Link (P.L. 110-351).....	77
AAP Reform - No Increase Based on Age.....	81
Foster Care and AAP Overpayments.....	83
FFH Rate Increase - AAP Impact.....	17
FC & NACF Administrative Costs - Basic Costs	85
Foster Care Reforms.....	89
Restructuring the Foster Care Group Home Rate System.....	91

Emergency Assistance - Foster Care Welfare	93
Court Cases - Foster Care	95
Child Welfare Services (CWS) - Basic Costs	97
Federal Budget Bill - Loss of FFP	103
Augmentation to Child Welfare Services	105
CWS/CMS System Support Staff	107
CWS - Emergency Assistance Program (TANF)	109
<i>Gomez v. Saenz</i>	111
Title XX Transfer to DDS	41
TANF Title XX Transfer to DDS	41
State Family Preservation	113
Extended Independent Living Program	115
Chafee Postsecondary Education and Training Vouchers	117
Transitional Housing for Foster Youth	119
STEP - Transitional Independent Living Plan Activity	45
Emancipated Foster Youth Stipends	123
Recruitment and Retention of Social Workers	125
Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program (Options for Recovery)	127
Dual Agency Supplement to the Rate	129
Foster Parent Training and Recruitment.....	131
Foster and Adoptive Family Recruitment Campaign	133
Minor Parent Services and Investigations	135
Foster Care - Infant Rate (SB 500).....	137
Kinship Support Services	139
Kinship/Foster Care Emergency Funds.....	141
CWS/CMS Staff Development	143
Supportive and Therapeutic Options Program (STOP).....	145
Group Home Monthly Visits.....	147
Caregiver Court Filing (SB 1667)	149
Criminal Records Check for FR (AB 1774).....	151
Background Checks.....	153
Relative Home Approvals.....	155
Multiple Relative Home Approvals.....	159
Grievance Review for Relatives	161
Live Scan Technology.....	163
Health Oversight and Coordination (PL 110-351).....	165

County Self-Assessment and SIP Development.....	167
Federal Child & Family Services Review.....	169
Data Requirements for New Activities	171
Peer Quality Case Reviews.....	173
Child Fatality and Near Fatality PQCR's.....	175
Statewide Standardized Training	177
CWS DR, SA, and PYS.....	179
CWS Outcome Improvement Project	181
Safe & Timely Interstate Placement of Foster Care Act of 2006.....	183
Adam Walsh Child Protection & Safety Act of 2006	185
Child Relationships (AB 408 amended by AB 1412)	189
Personalized Transition Plan (PL 110-351)	191
Resource Family Approval Pilot (AB 340)	193
SSI/SSP FC Application (AB 1331).....	197
Health Benefit Determination (AB 1512).....	199
Foster Youth Identity Theft (AB 2985).....	201
Increase Funding for Caseworker Visits.....	203
Chafee Federal National Youth in Transition Database.....	205
Registered Sex Offender Check.....	207
Increase Family Case Planning Meetings	211
Notification of Relatives (PL 110-351).....	213
Increase Relative Search and Engagement	215
CWS Reduction	217
Probation Access to CWS/CMS	219
Educational Stability (P.L. 110-351)	55
Foster Care Placement and Proximity to School of Origin (SB 1353).....	221
Sibling Placement (AB 743)	223
Court Cases - CWS	225
Adoptions Program - Basic Costs.....	227
Private Agency Adoption Reimbursement Payments (PAARP)	229
Foster and Adoptive Home Recruitment.....	231
County Counsel Costs	233
Nonrecurring Adoption Expenses	235
Specialized Training for Adoptive Parents (STAP)	237
Nonresident Petitions for Adoption (AB 746).....	239
County Third Party Contracts.....	241

County Services Block Grant - Basic Costs.....	243
Adult Protective Services	245
Reduce APS Program by Ten Percent.....	247
Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project	249

Extend Foster Care, Kin-GAP, and AAP Benefits (AB 12)

DESCRIPTION:

The premise will require the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to amend its current Title IV-E state plan to extend benefits up to age 21 for youth in the Foster Care (FC), Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (Kin-GAP) program, Federal Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (Fed-GAP) program, and Adoption Assistance Program (AAP) who meet one of the five specified criteria. This premise will implement the provisions of Assembly Bill (AB) 12 (Chapter 559, Statutes of 2010), which exercises the federal option of extending FC benefits detailed in the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008, Public Law (P.L.) 110-351. This premise will create a new population of dependent youth, referred to as non-minor dependents. This premise will extend the age limit to receive benefits in order to provide longer support to assist these youth in learning how to be self-sufficient while still having the security of a supervised living placement with the goal of improving outcomes for this population when they transition to self-sufficiency.

Eligibility for extended benefits up to age 21 will be available to youth who meet at least one of the five following criteria.

- Is completing secondary education or a program leading to an equivalent credential.
- Is enrolled in an institution which provides postsecondary or vocational education.
- Is participating in a program or activity designed to promote, or remove barriers to employment.
- Is employed for at least 80 hours a month.
- Is incapable of doing any of the above due to a medical condition which is documented regularly in the child's case plan.

In addition to the above criteria, for the AAP, Kin-GAP, and Fed-GAP programs, the non-minor dependent had to have entered one of these programs at age 16 or older.

AB 12 also authorizes Kin-GAP cases that are determined to have a disability to receive extended benefits up to age 21; regardless of the age these cases were upon entering Kin-GAP. Extending benefits for disabled cases was effective as of January 1, 2011

The extension of benefits up to age 19 will implement on January 1, 2012. On January 1, 2013, the extension of benefits will increase to age 20. On January 1, 2014, if CDSS determines that there are sufficient funds available; benefits may be extended up to age 21.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

Extending benefits for disabled Kin-GAP cases beyond age 18 become effective on January 1, 2011.

The extension of benefits beyond age 18 for all other qualified cases will implement on January 1, 2012.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: AB 12 and P.L. 110-351.

Kin-GAP Caseload

- Assumes two Kin-GAP cases will extend beyond age 18 due to a disability. This is based on the number of Kin-GAP Dual Agency cases, by age, as of March 31, 2010.

Extend Foster Care, Kin-GAP, and AAP Benefits (AB 12)

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Assumes nine cases will enter the Kin-GAP program annually at the age of 16 or older. This is based on entrances into the Kin-GAP program, by age, as of April 1, 2010. Five percent of these entrances will either enter or remain in the Kin-GAP program, 95 percent will either enter or transfer to the Fed-GAP program. This includes the impact of Kin-GAP Interstate Compact for the Placement of Children (ICPC) cases residing outside of California.
- Data from the Urban Institute Report was used to determine how many cases will continue to receive Kin-GAP benefits beyond age 18. See "Foster Care Caseload" for more information.
- Effective January 1, 2012, it is projected that one Kin-GAP case per month will receive extended benefits beyond age 18, resulting in an average monthly caseload of two cases in Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12.

Foster Care Caseload

- The FC estimate reflects costs and caseload data for the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties and the Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- Data from the Urban Institute Report on extending FC benefits to 21 years of age indicated that 60.6 percent of foster youth that would normally emancipate at age 17, will continue to receive FC benefits until age 19 as a result of AB 12. This data assumes a four percent re-entry rate.
- Non-minors who are FC "Services Only" cases or California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) "Child Only" cases will be eligible to receive FC benefits as a result of AB 12 and elect to stay in the program at the same rate as the FC caseload. Further assumptions and data listed under "CalWORKs Child Only".
- Starting January 1, 2012, it is projected that an additional 104 FC non-minor dependents 18 years of age (dependants and wards) will be phased into the program each month. As a result of this phase in, FY 2011-12 will have an average monthly caseload of 361 FC non-minor dependents 18 years of age receiving extended benefits.

Foster Care Placement Options

- FC Placement options reflect data that was used in the California Fostering Connections Webinar. Adjustments were made to the Group Home (GH) and the Transitional Housing Program – Plus (THP-Plus) placements options.
- Assumes that of the additional FC youths served, relative placements will account for 22 percent of the total FC placements in AB 12 or an average of 80 monthly cases for FY 2011-12. Federal cases are projected to account for 100 percent of total relative placements.
- Assumes that of the additional FC youths served, Non-Dependant Non Related Legal Guardians (NDNRLG) placements will account for 15 percent of the total FC placements in AB 12 or an average of 54 monthly cases for FY 2011-12. Nonfederal cases are projected to account for 100 percent of total NDNRLG placements.
- Assumes that of the additional FC youths served, Foster Family Home (FFH) placements will account for eight percent of the total FC placements in AB 12 or an average of 29 monthly cases for FY 2011-12. Federal cases are projected to account for 67.0 percent of total

Extend Foster Care, Kin-GAP, and AAP Benefits (AB 12)

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

FFH placements.

- Assumes that of the additional FC youths served, Supervised Independent Living (SIL) placements will account for 15 percent of the total FC placements in AB 12 or an average of 54 monthly cases for FY 2011-12. Federal cases are projected to account for 67.0 percent of total SIL placements.
- Assumes that of the additional FC youths served, Foster Family Agency (FFA) placements will account for 15 percent of the total FC placements in AB 12 or an average of 54 monthly cases for FY 2011-12. Federal cases are projected to account for 73.4 percent of total FFA placements.
- Assumes that of the additional FC youths served, GH placements will account for five percent of the total FC placements in AB 12 or an average of 18 monthly cases for FY 2011-12. Federal cases are projected to account for 48.5 percent of total GH placements.
- Assumes that of the additional FC youths served, THP-Plus FC placements will account for 20 percent of the total FC placements in AB 12 or an average of 72 monthly cases for FY 2011-12. Based on information from the John Burton Foundation, the federal cases are projected to account for 61.4 percent of total THP-Plus FC placements. The estimate assumes that the total cost for the additional FC youths served in the THP-Plus FC will be absorbed through the existing THP – Plus program by way of a funding shift.

CalWORKs “Child Only” Caseload

- FC “services only” cases that are ineligible to receive Title IV-E FC payments instead receive a cash-aid grant at the “exempt” MAP level from the CalWORKs program, but case management services from Child Welfare Services (CWS). They are referred to in CalWORKs as a “child only” case.
- CalWORKs program rules currently allow any child to continue receiving a CalWORKs grant after turning 18 if the child is attending high school and is anticipated to graduate before or by their 19th birthday. The CalWORKs program is currently serving 64.3 percent of all Child Only cases living with a non-needy caretaker relative that turn 18 years old. These cases are eligible to be funded by TANF/Maintenance of Effort (MOE) and thus are excluded from this estimate.
- Non-minors who choose to remain with their non-needy caretaker relatives and continue receiving a CalWORKs grant will not be subject to the Welfare-to-Work requirements and thus will not receive any supportive services.
- This additional CalWORKs population is not eligible to fund with TANF/MOE; grant costs and administrative funds are funded solely through a state-only program.
- Assumes that 361 FC cases and 42 probation cases will turn 18 each month in FY 2011-12 and can qualify for extended benefits if otherwise eligible as of January 1, 2012.
- Assumes that 3.6 percent of FC cases on probation are in relative homes and could qualify for a CalWORKs child only grant, resulting in a total of 363 FC cases per month that could possibly qualify for a CalWORKs child only grant.
- Based on a point-in-time caseload distribution from April 2010, it is assumed that 3.82 percent

Extend Foster Care, Kin-GAP, and AAP Benefits (AB 12)

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- of the FC caseload is a CalWORKs child only case, and that 35.7 percent of those cases are 18 year olds that are not already currently receiving a CalWORKs grant under current policy.
- As with the FC caseload, this estimate assumes that 60.6 percent of FC cases with a CalWORKs child only grant that would normally emancipate will instead have extended benefits through AB 12.
- Assumes that 32 percent of Child Only cases will choose to leave their non-needy caretaker relative, upon turning 18. This action will make them eligible for Title IV-E FC benefits; they will receive their benefit payments under the FC program. The remaining 68 percent of the child only cases will continue to remain with their non-needy caretaker relative and receive a CalWORKs child-only grant.
- The extension of benefits past age 18, starting January 1, 2012, thus results in an additional two cases per month for the CalWORKs program.

Fed-GAP Caseload

- Assumes that 151 cases will enter the Fed-GAP program annually at the age of 16 or older. This is based on entrances into the Kin-GAP program, by age, as of April 1, 2010. 95 percent of these entrances will either enter or transfer to the Fed-GAP program, five percent will either enter or remain in the Kin-GAP program. This includes the impact of Fed-GAP ICPC cases residing outside of California.
- Data from the Urban Institute Report was used to determine how many cases will continue to receive Fed-GAP benefits beyond age 18. See "Foster Care Caseload" for more information.
- Effective January 1, 2012, it is projected that seven Fed-GAP cases per month will receive extended benefits beyond age 18, resulting in an average monthly caseload of 25 cases in FY 2011-12.

AAP Caseload

- Assumes that 198 cases will enter AAP annually at age 16 or older. This is based on entrances into AAP, by age, during FY 2008-09.
- Assumes that 75 percent of cases that enter AAP at age 16 or older will continue to receive benefits beyond age 18.
- Effective January 1, 2012, it is projected that nine AAP cases per month will receive extended benefits beyond age 18, resulting in an average monthly caseload of 33 cases in FY 2011-12.

Extend Foster Care, Kin-GAP, and AAP Benefits (AB 12)

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

CalWORKs Cost Avoidance Caseload

- Assumes that a portion of FC youth whose benefits are extended by AB 12 would have otherwise enrolled in the CalWORKs program after emancipating. This estimate includes cost avoidance to CalWORKs because these cases receive extended FC benefits.
- Based on the CDSS Foster Care Emancipation Exit Outcomes Report (SOC 405 E) from January - December 2009, it is assumed that 5.4 percent of emancipated FC youth would have otherwise enrolled in the CalWORKs program. This percentage is applied to the total FC caseload and CalWORKs Child Only caseload expected to continue receiving benefits as a result of AB 12 (364 cases per month).
- Assumes that FC non-minors with a child who emancipate at age 18 while living in a GH (33 percent of FC cases) will elect to enroll in the CalWORKs program rather than extend their FC benefits, resulting in cost avoidance for 67 percent of the caseload.
- The extension of benefits through AB 12 thus results in cost avoidance to the CalWORKs program for an average of 13 cases per month, beginning January 1, 2012.

CalFresh Caseload

- Assumes that cases that stay in FC that would otherwise have been eligible for CalFresh under AB 719 and would be reflected as cost avoidance to the Transitional CalFresh for Foster Youth Program.
- Based on an average of 104 cases per month that will receive extended foster care benefits under AB 12, it is assumed that 7.27 percent will not be eligible for CalFresh benefits due to Social Security Income (SSI) benefits. Additionally, approximately 20 percent of the 104 cases will not be eligible for CalFresh benefits due to student status. This results in CalFresh and administrative and grant savings for approximately 75 new cases per month in FY 2011-12.

Kin-GAP Grants

- The projected Kin-GAP grant will be \$683.20 for FY 2011-12. This is a combination of the basic grant for ages 15-19, based on the FC FFH schedule of basic rate, at \$627, in addition to estimated additional Kin-GAP benefits of \$56.20.
- The impact of the California Foster Parent Association, et al vs. John A. Wagner court decision that increases the FFH basic rate will be displayed in the FFH Rate Increase – FFH Impact premise.

Foster Care Grants

- The grants used for the FC placement options of relatives, NDNRLG, and FFH were calculated by adding estimated additional FC benefits of \$283.63 to the basic grant for ages 15-19 of \$627. The projected federal and/or nonfederal grant for the relatives, NDNRLG, and FFH placements is \$910.63 for FY 2011-12.
- The impact of the *California Foster Parent Association, et al vs. John A. Wagner* court decision that increases the FFH basic rate will be displayed in the FFH Rate Increase – FFH Impact premise.

Extend Foster Care, Kin-GAP, and AAP Benefits (AB 12)

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- The federal and nonfederal grants used for the SIL placement were calculated by adding estimated additional FC clothing allowance benefits of \$14.80 to the basic grant for ages 15-19 of \$627. The projected federal and nonfederal grant for SIL placements is \$641.80 for FY 2011-12.
- The FFA grant is established through the normal budgeting process. The projected federal grant is \$1,530.20 and the projected nonfederal grant is \$2,002.63 for FFA placements in FY 2011-12. The impact of the ten percent FFA rate reduction is reflected in this grant.
- The GH and THP-Plus grants are established through the normal budgeting process. The projected federal grant is \$6,866.12 and the projected nonfederal grant is \$8,203.03 for GH placements in FY 2011-12. The projected federal and nonfederal grant is \$2,906.89 for THP-Plus placements in FY 2011-12.
- GH and THP-Plus grants have been adjusted to include a 32 percent rate increase and California Necessities Index (CNI) increases starting in FY 2010-11 through FY 2011-12. The CNI projections are 1.57 percent for FY 2010-11 and 1.92 percent FY 2011-12.

CalWORKs Child Only Grants

- The projected Child Only grant will be \$351 (the maximum aid payment for an assistance unit of one, exempt status, in CalWORKs) for FY 2011-12.

Fed-GAP Grants

- The projected Fed-GAP grant is \$750.18 for FY 2011-12. This is a combination of the basic grant for ages 15-19, based on the FC FFH schedule of basic rate, at \$627, in addition to estimated additional Fed-GAP benefits of \$123.18.
- The impact of the *California Foster Parent Association, et al vs. John A. Wagner* court decision that increases the FFH basic rate will be displayed in the FFH Rate Increase – FFH Impact premise.

AAP Grants

- The projected AAP grant is \$926.15 for FY 2011-12. This is a combination of the basic grant for ages 15-19, based on the FC FFH schedule of basic rate, at \$627, in addition to estimated additional AAP benefits of \$299.15.
- The impact of the *California Foster Parent Association, et al vs. John A. Wagner* court decision that increases the FFH basic rate will be displayed in the FFH Rate Increase – FFH Impact premise.

CalWORKs Cost Avoidance Grants

- The projected grant cost avoidance for FC youth who would have otherwise enrolled in CalWORKs is \$516, which is the maximum aid payment for an assistance unit of two.

CalFresh Grants

- The maximum aid benefit for emancipated foster youth receiving Transitional CalFresh benefits is assumed to be \$200 per month for the first 12 months in CalFresh in accordance with AB 719.

Extend Foster Care, Kin-GAP, and AAP Benefits (AB 12)

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Based on historic California Food Assistance Program (CFAP) and CalFresh caseloads, the CFAP caseload/benefits are approximately one percent of the CalFresh caseload/benefits.

Kin-GAP Administration

- Based on actual Kin-GAP expenditure data, the projected average monthly administrative grant is \$40.67 per case for FY 2011-12.

Foster Care Administration

- Based on actual FC expenditure data from Calendar Year 2010, the projected average monthly administrative grant is \$95.31 per case for FY 2011-12. The total FC administrative cost is \$207,000 for FY 2011-12.
- Assumes that ICPC cases residing outside of California will create a savings to the FC administration. The total FC administrative savings as a result of ICPC cases is \$519,000 for FY 2011-12.

CalWORKs Child Only Administration

- The monthly CalWORKs administration cost is \$33.58 per case.

Fed-GAP Administration

- Based on actual Kin-GAP expenditure data, the projected average monthly administrative grant is \$40.67 per case for FY 2011-12.

AAP Administration

- Based on actual AAP expenditure data from Calendar Year 2010, the projected administrative grant is \$16.85 per case for FY 2011-12.

CWS Administration

- Assumes a caseload of 156 dependants and 30 wards will receive extended benefits up to age 19 in FY 2011-12.
- Assumes a workload standard of 31 cases per social worker at a cost of \$129,074 per social worker.
- Assumes additional social worker costs for the increased caseloads for the following premises: Group Home Monthly Visits, Caregiver Court Filing, Child Relationships, Increase Funding for Case Worker Visits, Health Oversight and Coordination, Criminal Background Checks, and Personalized Transition Plans.

CalWORKs Cost Avoidance Administration and Services

- The projected administrative cost avoidance for FC youth who would have otherwise enrolled in CalWORKs is a one-time \$197.75 fee per new case for intake costs and \$33.58 per case per month for ongoing administrative costs.
- The projected employment services cost avoidance is \$26,848. Representing a loss of 0.003 percent of the employment services caseload.

Extend Foster Care, Kin-GAP, and AAP Benefits (AB 12)

METHODOLOGY:

- The projected child care cost avoidance is \$786.51 per child per month. The estimate assumes the normal child care utilization rate for CalWORKs, which is 25.58 percent based on Calendar Year 2010 actual data.

CalFresh Administration

- It is assumed that the intake cost is \$51 per case.
- It is assumed that quarterly reporting requirements do not apply in the first 12 months under Transitional CalFresh under AB 719.
- The CFAP impact is adjusted to reflect the recent change in the CFAP caseload trend.

Automation

- It is assumed that the costs for automation are estimated to be \$2 million in the Budget Year (BY) and will be split evenly among the programs that are impacted by AB 12.

Kin-GAP

- To estimate the cost of the extending Kin-GAP benefits, the total number of casemonths is multiplied by the average Kin-GAP rate. Kin-GAP administrative costs are calculated by multiplying the projected casemonths by the monthly administrative cost per case.

Foster Care 101

- The basic costs for Relative, NDNRLG, FFH, SIL, FFA, GH, and THP-Plus placements are the product of federal and/or nonfederal monthly caseloads multiplied by the average grants, as identified above.

CalWORKs Child Only

- The grant and admin costs are calculated by multiplying the caseload by the average grant cost per case per month and average admin cost per case per month, respectively.

Fed-GAP

- To estimate the cost of the extending Fed-GAP benefits, the total number of casemonths is multiplied by the average Fed-GAP rate. Fed-GAP administrative costs are calculated by multiplying the projected casemonths by the monthly administrative cost per case.

AAP

- To estimate the cost of the extending AAP benefits, the total number of casemonths is multiplied by the average AAP rate. AAP administrative costs are calculated by multiplying the projected casemonths by the monthly administrative cost per case.

Foster Care 141

- The FC administrative cost for this premise is the product of projected monthly caseloads multiplied by the average grant, as identified above.

CalWORKs Cost Avoidance

- Grant cost avoidance is calculated by multiplying the maximum aid payment for an assistance unit of two by the number of months that a case would have been on aid.

Extend Foster Care, Kin-GAP, and AAP Benefits (AB 12)

METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

- Admin cost avoidance is calculated by multiplying the intake costs by the number of new cases and added to the ongoing monthly admin cost multiplied by the number of case-months.
- Services cost avoidance is calculated by removing the cost avoidance caseload from the Employment Services Basic estimate and calculating the difference in estimated expenditures.
- Child Care cost avoidance is calculated by multiplying case-months by the cost per case for child care and by the utilization rate.

CWS Administration

- Basic costs are calculated by dividing the increased caseload by the workload standard, then multiplying by the annual cost of a social worker.
- Social worker costs for additional premises are also included, based on increased caseload.

CalFresh

- CalFresh administrative savings are calculated by multiplying the number of CalFresh eligible cases remaining in foster care per month by the CalFresh intake cost. The CFAP benefit savings are calculated by multiplying the cumulative number of new CalFresh eligible cases remaining in foster care per month by the maximum CalFresh benefits, then by one percent.

FUNDING:

The AB 12 costs/savings are shared at the same ratios as in their respective programs. Extended benefits through CalWORKs for FC Services Only cases are 100 percent state-funded and not MOE countable. Cost avoidance for CalWORKs grants are 97.5 percent TANF and 2.5 percent county funded. Administration, services and child care cost avoidance are 100 percent TANF.

Funding for automation for FC and AAP is split 50 percent federal fund and 50 percent General Fund (GF). Kin-GAP and CalWORKs state-only program costs are 100 percent GF.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

For CalWORKS Cost Avoidance, the decrease in the (Budget Year) BY is due to a decrease in the Child Care cost per case and utilization rate, as well as the 8% MAP reduction to CalWORKs grants.

For FC, the increase in the BY is due to increases in the overall FC grant, slightly offset by a shift of cases moving from federal to non-federal cases.

For Kin-GAP, there is no change.

For Fed-GAP, the increase in the BY is due to increases in the Fed-GAP grant.

For AAP, the increase in the BY is due to increases in the AAP grant.

For CalFresh, the slight decrease in BY is due to an adjustment to CFAP costs to reflect the CFAP caseload which is not increasing as much as previously projected.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY increase is due to the impact of extending all the qualified cases beyond age 18.

Extend Foster Care, Kin-GAP, and AAP Benefits (AB 12)

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

Summary – Total Funds	2010-11	2011-12
CalWORKs Cost Avoidance	\$0	-\$92
Kin-Gap	\$9	\$22
Foster Care	\$0	\$2,520
Fed-Gap	\$0	\$120
AAP	\$0	\$188
CFAP	\$0	-\$3
CalWORKs Child Only	\$0	\$15
CalFresh	\$0	-\$22
THP-Plus	\$0	-\$876
Automation	\$0	\$2,000
CWS/CMS Automation	\$0	\$800
CWS Administration	\$0	\$938

CalWORKs – Item 101 Grant Cost Avoidance	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$0	-\$42
Federal	0	-41
State	0	0
County	0	-1
Reimbursements	0	0

CalWORKs – Item 101 Services Cost Avoidance	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$0	-\$27
Federal	0	-27
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Extend Foster Care, Kin-GAP, and AAP Benefits (AB 12)

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

CalWORKs – Item 101	2010-11	2011-12
Admin. Cost Avoidance		

Total	\$0	-\$7
Federal	0	-7
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

CalWORKs – Item 101	2010-11	2011-12
Child Care Cost Avoidance		

Total	\$0	-\$16
Federal	0	-16
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Kin-GAP – Item 101	2010-11	2011-12
Grant Impact		

Total	\$8	\$21
Federal	0	0
State	6	17
County	2	4
Reimbursements	0	0

Kin-GAP – Item 101	2010-11	2011-12
Admin. Impact		

Total	\$1	\$1
Federal	0	0
State	1	1
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Extend Foster Care, Kin-GAP, and AAP Benefits (AB 12)

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

Foster Care – Item 101 Grant Impact	2010-11	2011-12
--	----------------	----------------

Total	\$0	\$2,832
Federal	0	643
State	0	876
County	0	1,313
Reimbursements	0	0

Fed-GAP – Item 101 Grant Impact	2010-11	2011-12
--	----------------	----------------

Total	\$0	\$114
Federal	0	57
State	0	45
County	0	12
Reimbursements	0	0

AAP – Item 101 Grant Impact	2010-11	2011-12
--	----------------	----------------

Total	\$0	\$184
Federal	0	92
State	0	69
County	0	23
Reimbursements	0	0

California Food Assistance Program – Item 101 Grant Impact	2010-11	2011-12
---	----------------	----------------

Total	\$0	-\$3
Federal	0	0
State	0	-3
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Extend Foster Care, Kin-GAP, and AAP Benefits (AB 12)

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

CalWORKs – Item 101 Grant Impact	2010-11	2011-12
-------------------------------------	---------	---------

Total	\$0	\$14
Federal	0	0
State	0	14
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

CalWORKs – Item 101 Admin. Impact	2010-11	2011-12
--------------------------------------	---------	---------

Total	\$0	\$1
Federal	0	0
State	0	1
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Foster Care – Item 141 Admin. Impact	2010-11	2011-12
---	---------	---------

Total	\$0	-\$312
Federal	0	-92
State	0	-154
County	0	-66
Reimbursements	0	0

AAP – Item 141 Admin. Impact	2010-11	2011-12
---------------------------------	---------	---------

Total	\$0	\$4
Federal	0	2
State	0	1
County	0	1
Reimbursements	0	0

Extend Foster Care, Kin-GAP, and AAP Benefits (AB 12)

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

Fed-GAP – Item 141 Admin. Impact	2010-11	2011-12
---	----------------	----------------

Total	\$0	\$6
Federal	0	3
State	0	3
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

CalFresh – Item 141 Admin. Impact	2010-11	2011-12
--	----------------	----------------

Total	\$0	-\$22
Federal	0	-11
State	0	-11
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Automation – Item 141	2010-11	2011-12
------------------------------	----------------	----------------

Total	\$0	\$2,000
Federal	0	500
State	0	1,500
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

THP-Plus – Item 151 Shift to FC	2010-11	2011-12
--	----------------	----------------

Total	\$0	-\$876
Federal	0	0
State	0	-876
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Extend Foster Care, Kin-GAP, and AAP Benefits (AB 12)

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

CWS/CMS – Item 151 Automation

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$0	\$800
Federal	0	437
State	0	363
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

CWS Admin – Item 151

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$0	\$938
Federal	0	301
State	0	461
County	0	176
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

FFH Rate Increase

DESCRIPTION:

This premise is a result of the court decision *California Foster Parent Association, et al vs. John A. Wagner*. This lawsuit challenged the adequacy of California's Foster Family Home (FFH) rates. The summary judgment in the court case required that California develop a systematic method for meeting its federal obligations in regards to Foster Care maintenance payments. The court ordered the state to take the enumerated cost factors contained in the Child Welfare Act into consideration when determining a new FFH rate structure. This new rate structure should not fall too far out of line with providing those items. The court order provides authority to change the rate-setting methodology in current statute, it is expected that statutory and regulatory change will ultimately be needed. The Department contracted with The Center for Public Policy Research (CPPR) at University of California, Davis to conduct a study to develop alternative methodologies for setting the FFH rate in California.

The new FFH rate structure developed by the CPPR will impact only current FFH cases excluding Non-Related Legal Guardians (NRLG). It will also impact prospective Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (Kin-GAP) cases, prospective NRLG cases, prospective federal Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (Fed-GAP) program cases and prospective Adoption Assistance Program (AAP) cases.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implements on July 1, 2011.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: *California Foster Parent Association, et al vs. John A. Wagner* court decision.
- This estimate reflects costs for all the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties and the Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The new statewide FFH rate structure is based on the enumerated cost factors such as food, shelter, school supplies, daily supervision, clothing, personal incidentals, liabilities insurance, home/court transportation and 50 percent cost of providing. The cost of providing factor is based on transportation cost to and from extracurricular, childcare, recreational and cultural activities.
- Beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 2012-13, the new rate structure will be adjusted annually according to the Consumer Price Index (CPI) cost of living indicator.
- The rate changes by age range are as follows:
 - Current basic rate for age range 0-4 is \$446; this increases to \$609.
 - Current basic rate for age range 5-8 is \$485; this increases to \$660.
 - Current basic rate for age range 9-11 is \$519; this increases to \$695.
 - Current basic rate for age range 12-14 is \$573; this increases to \$727.
 - Current basic rate for age range 15-19 is \$627; this increases to \$761.
- The new rate structure contains additional monies for clothing, so the State Supplemental Clothing Allowance Program will be discontinued for all FFH cases, beginning July 1, 2011. The clothing allowance provided by counties will continue and will not be impacted by this new rate. The State Supplemental Clothing Allowance includes the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver

FFH Rate Increase

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

counties and the Title IV-E Waiver counties. For more information, please see the Supplemental Clothing Allowance premise description.

- Current FFH cases and prospective permanent placements (Kin-GAP, Fed-GAP and AAP) will be subject to the new rate structure. Existing permanent placements including NRLGs will remain under the existing rate structure and will not be subject to the rate increase.
- **FFH** - The estimate assumes an average monthly caseload of 18,378 current FFH cases (excluding NRLG's) and 163 current FFH Assembly Bill (AB) 12 cases will be impacted by the FFH rate increase. The percentage of children ages 0-4 is estimated to be 43.5 percent, the children ages 5-8 is estimated to be 14.5 percent, the children ages 9-11 is estimated to be 9.1 percent, the children ages 12-14 is estimated to be 11.6 percent and the children ages 15-19 is estimated to be 21.3 percent. It is estimated that 77 percent of FFH cases (excluding NRLG's) are federally eligible.
- **Tribal State-Title IV-E** - The estimate assumes an average monthly caseload of 17 current Tribal State-Title IV-E FFH cases will be impacted by the FFH rate increase. The percentage of children ages 0-4 is estimated to be 43.5 percent, the children ages 5-8 is estimated to be 14.5 percent, the children ages 9-11 is estimated to be 9.1 percent, the children ages 12-14 is estimated to be 11.6 percent and the children ages 15-19 is estimated to be 21.3 percent. It is estimated that 100 percent of Tribal State-Title IV-E FFH cases are federally eligible.
- **NRLG** - The estimate assumes an average monthly caseload of 59 prospective NRLG cases and 1 prospective NRLG AB 12 case will be impacted by the FFH rate increase. The percentage of children ages 0-4 is estimated to be 7.8 percent, the children ages 5-8 is estimated to be 14.3 percent, the children ages 9-11 is estimated to be 16.3 percent, the children ages 12-14 is estimated to be 23.7 percent and the children ages 15-19 is estimated to be 37.9 percent. It is estimated that 100 percent of NRLG cases are State only.
- **AAP** - The estimate assumes an average monthly caseload of 3,470 prospective AAP cases and 14 prospective AAP AB 12 cases will be impacted by the FFH rate increase. The percentage of children ages 0-4 is estimated to be 43.5 percent, the children ages 5-8 is estimated to be 14.5 percent, the children ages 9-11 is estimated to be 9.1 percent, the children ages 12-14 is estimated to be 11.6 percent and the children ages 15-19 is estimated to be 21.3 percent. It is estimated that 84 percent of AAP cases are federally eligible.
- **Kin-GAP** - The estimate assumes an average monthly caseload of 45 prospective Kin-GAP cases and 2 prospective Kin-GAP AB 12 cases will be impacted by the FFH rate increase. The percentage of children ages 0-4 is estimated to be 43.5 percent, the children ages 5-8 is estimated to be 14.5 percent, the children ages 9-11 is estimated to be 9.1 percent, the children ages 12-14 is estimated to be 11.6 percent and the children ages 15-19 is estimated to be 21.3 percent. It is estimated that 100 percent of Kin-GAP cases are State only.
- **Fed-GAP** - The estimate assumes an average monthly caseload of 853 prospective Fed-GAP cases and 25 prospective Fed-GAP AB 12 cases will be impacted by the FFH rate increase. The percentage of children ages 0-4 is estimated to be 43.5 percent, the children ages 5-8 is estimated to be 14.5 percent, the children ages 9-11 is estimated to be 9.1 percent, the children ages 12-14 is estimated to be 11.6 percent and the children ages 15-19 is estimated to be 21.3 percent. It is estimated that 100 percent of Fed-GAP cases are federally eligible.

FFH Rate Increase

METHODOLOGY:

The costs associated with the FFH Rate Increase are the product of average monthly caseloads within the categorized ages multiplied by the difference between the current basic rate and the increased basic rate, as identified above.

FUNDING:

The FFH Rate Increase costs are shared at the same ratios as in their respective programs.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

This is a new premise.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The Budget Year reflects a full year of cost.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

FFH Rate Increase – Total Impact

	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$41,307
Federal	0	16,369
State	0	10,741
County	0	14,197
Reimbursements	0	0

FFH Rate Increase – Kin-GAP Impact

	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$87
Federal	0	0
State	0	69
County	0	18
Reimbursements	0	0

FFH Rate Increase

EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)

FFH Rate Increase – Supp. Clothing Allowance Impact

	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	-\$2,345
Federal	0	-786
State	0	-1,559
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

FFH Rate Increase – Tribal Impact

	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$32
Federal	0	16
State	0	7
County	0	9
Reimbursements	0	0

FFH Rate Increase – FFH Impact

	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$35,154
Federal	0	13,534
State	0	8,648
County	0	12,972
Reimbursements	0	0

FFH Rate Increase

EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)

FFH Rate Increase – NLRG Impact

	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$109
Federal	0	0
State	0	44
County	0	65
Reimbursements	0	0

FFH Rate Increase – Fed-GAP Impact

	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$1,648
Federal	0	824
State	0	651
County	0	173
Reimbursements	0	0

FFH Rate Increase – AAP Impact

	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$6,622
Federal	0	2,781
State	0	2,881
County	0	960
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Foster Family Home – Basic Costs

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects expenditures associated with children eligible for foster care payments that are placed in foster family homes (FFHs) for the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. Funds for the Waiver counties are included in Item 153, Title IV-E Waiver.

The federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC) program provides funds for out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children removed from the custody of a parent or guardian as a result of a judicial order with requisite findings or a voluntary placement agreement. The state AFDC-FC program also provides out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children, including those who are residing with a nonrelated legal guardian, relinquished for the purposes of adoption, or placed pursuant to the Indian Child Welfare Act.

FFHs provide 24-hour care and supervision in a family environment for children who cannot live in their own home. FFHs have a capacity of six or less and are either homes licensed by state or county community care licensing agencies or are approved homes of relatives or nonrelated legal guardians. FFH reimbursement rates are based on the age of the child in placement and range from \$446 to \$627 per month. A specialized care increment may be paid to a family home in addition to the basic rate on behalf of an AFDC-FC child requiring specialized care because of health and/or behavioral problems. A clothing allowance may also be paid in addition to the basic rate on behalf of an AFDC-FC eligible child.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11461.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The caseload presumed to be eligible for federal and nonfederal Foster Care (FC) program benefits is based on the 17 month period, ending November 2010 as reported by the counties on the FC Caseload Movement and Expenditures Report (CA 237 FC). Federal cases are projected to account for 65.30 percent of total FFH placements.
- Federal and nonfederal average grant computations utilized caseload and expenditure data reported by the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties on the CA 237 FC during the most recent 17 month period ending November 2010. The projected federal grant is \$711.63 and the nonfederal grant is \$832.44.
- The impact of the *California Foster Parent Association, et al vs. John A. Wagner* court decision that increases the FFH basic rate will be displayed in the FFH Rate Increase – FFH Impact premise.
- The percentage of federally-eligible expenditures is based on actual county expenditure data.
- The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

METHODOLOGY:

FFH basic costs are the product of projected federal and nonfederal case months and average grant, as identified above.

Foster Family Home – Basic Costs

FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided for by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 percent General Fund and 60 percent county.

The Title IV-E FMAP rate temporarily increased by 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. This increase was approved by the federal government to extend until June 30, 2011. This extension of the ARRA results in an increase of 3.2 percent for the third quarter of FY 2010-11 and an increase of 1.2 percent for the fourth quarter of FY 2010-11. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The Current Year increase is the net impact of a projected caseload increase of 1.8 percent and a slight decrease in the federal grant and a 3.3 percent increase in the non-federal grant. The Budget Year increase is a result of higher caseload than was projected in the November 2010 Subvention.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This decrease reflects a projected caseload decline of 14.2 percent.

CASELOAD:

	2010-11	2011-12
Average Monthly Caseload	17,768	15,240
Federal Caseload	11,603	9,952
Nonfederal Caseload	6,165	5,288

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

FFH – Basic Costs	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$160,668	\$137,807
Federal	44,164	37,880
State	46,602	39,971
County	69,902	59,956
Reimbursements	0	0

Foster Family Home – Basic Costs

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

FFH – Federal	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$99,086	\$84,993
Federal	44,164	37,880
State	21,969	18,849
County	32,953	28,264
Reimbursements	0	0
FFH – Nonfederal	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$61,582	\$52,820
Federal	0	0
State	24,633	21,128
County	36,949	31,692
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Group Home – Basic Costs

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with children eligible for foster care payments who are placed in Group Homes (GH) for the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. Funds for the Waiver counties are included in Item 153, Title IV-E Waiver.

The federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC) program provides funds for out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children removed from the custody of a parent or guardian as a result of a judicial order with requisite findings or a voluntary placement agreement. The state AFDC-FC program also provides out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children, including those who are residing with a nonrelated legal guardian, relinquished for the purposes of adoption, or placed pursuant to the Indian Child Welfare Act.

GHs are private, nonprofit, non-detention facilities that provide services in a group setting to children in need of care and supervision. GHs are the most restrictive out-of-home placement alternative for children in foster care, providing an option for children with significant emotional or behavioral problems who would otherwise require more restrictive environments. GH programs are reimbursed based on classification levels within a standardized schedule of rates. The reimbursement for rate classification levels (RCL) 1 through 14 ranges from \$1,486 to \$6,694 per month.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11462.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The caseload presumed to be eligible for federal and nonfederal Foster Care (FC) program benefits is based on an 17 month period, ending November 2010, as reported by the counties on the FC Caseload Movement and Expenditures Report (CA 237 FC). Federal cases are projected to account for 51.80 percent of total GH placements.
- The federal and nonfederal average grant computations utilized caseload and expenditure data reported on the CA 237 FC during a 17 month period from July 2008 to November 2009. The projected federal grant is \$5,122.80 and the nonfederal grant is \$5,516.51. The projected federal and nonfederal grants were held to the 2010-11 Appropriation to reflect GH expenditure data before the GH and Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED) Rate Increase was implemented on December 14, 2009.
- The impact of the *California Alliance of Child and Family Services v. Cliff Allenby* court decision will be displayed in the Group Home and SED Rate Increase premise.
- The percentage of federally-eligible expenditures is based on actual county expenditure data.
- The amount of Federal Financial Participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

Group Home – Basic Costs

METHODOLOGY:

The basic costs are the product of federal and nonfederal caseloads and average grant, as identified above. Federal, state and county sharing ratios are based on county expenditure data.

FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 percent General Fund and 60 percent county.

Title IV-E FMAP rate temporarily increased by 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. This increase was approved by the federal government to extend until June 30, 2011. This extension of the ARRA results in an increase of 3.2 percent for the third quarter of FY 2010-11 and an increase of 1.2 percent for the fourth quarter of FY 2010-11. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The Current Year decrease is due to a projected caseload decline of 1.6 percent. The Budget Year decrease is a result of lower caseload than was projected in the November 2010 Subvention.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This decrease reflects a further projected caseload decline of 9.7 percent.

CASELOAD:

	2010-11	2011-12
Average Monthly Caseload	5,452	4,923
Federal Caseload	2,824	2,550
Nonfederal Caseload	2,628	2,373

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2010-11	2011-12
GH – Basic Costs	Grant	Grant
Total	\$347,560	\$313,846
Federal	77,375	69,869
State	108,074	97,591
County	162,111	146,386
Reimbursements	0	0

Group Home – Basic Costs

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

GH – Federal	2010-11 Grant	2011-12 Grant
Total	\$173,597	\$156,758
Federal	77,375	69,869
State	38,489	34,756
County	57,733	52,133
Reimbursements	0	0
GH – Nonfederal	2010-11 Grant	2011-12 Grant
Total	\$173,963	\$157,088
Federal	0	0
State	69,585	62,835
County	104,378	94,253
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Foster Family Agency – Basic Costs

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with children eligible for foster care payments who are placed with foster family agencies (FFAs) for the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. Funds for the waiver counties are included in Item 153, Title IV-E Waiver.

The federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC) program provides funds for out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children removed from the custody of a parent or guardian as a result of a judicial order with requisite findings or a voluntary placement agreement. The state AFDC-FC program also provides out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children, including those who are residing with a nonrelated legal guardian, relinquished for the purposes of adoption, or placed pursuant to the Indian Child Welfare Act.

FFAs are nonprofit agencies licensed to recruit, certify, train and support foster parents for children needing placement. FFAs primarily serve children who would otherwise require group home care. FFA treatment rates are established by using a basic rate similar to the foster family home rate plus a set increment for the special needs of the child, an increment for social work activities, and a percentage for administration, recruitment, and training. Treatment rates are based on the age of the child in placement and range from \$1,589 to \$1,865 per month. Reimbursement rates for FFAs participating in the Intensive Treatment Foster Care Program are based on the level of services provided to the child and range from \$2,985 to \$4,476. A clothing allowance may also be paid in addition to the FFA rate for an AFDC-FC eligible child.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 11463 and 18358.3.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The caseload presumed to be eligible for federal and nonfederal Foster Care (FC) program benefits are based on a 12 month period ending November 2010, as reported by the counties on the FC Caseload Movement and Expenditures Report (CA 237 FC). Federal cases are projected to account for 80.37 percent of total FFA placements.
- Federal and nonfederal average grant computations utilized caseload and expenditure data reported by the counties on the CA 237 FC during the most recent 12 month period ending November 2010. The projected federal grant is \$1,521.52 and the nonfederal grant is \$2,138.60.
- The percentage of federally-eligible expenditures is based on actual county expenditure data.
- The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

Foster Family Agency – Basic Costs

METHODOLOGY:

The basic costs are the product of federal and nonfederal caseloads and average grant, as identified above. Federal, state and county sharing ratios are based on county expenditure data.

FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 percent General Fund and 60 percent county.

The Title IV-E FMAP rate temporarily increased by 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. This increase was approved by the federal government to extend until June 30, 2011. This extension of the ARRA results in an increase of 3.2 percent for the third quarter of Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and an increase of 1.2 percent for the fourth quarter of FY 2010-11. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The Current Year decrease is an overall impact of a projected caseload decrease of 3.0 percent and a decrease in the non-federal grant and federal grant based on actual expenditures. The Budget Year decrease is a result of a lower caseload than was projected in the November 2010 Subvention.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This decrease reflects a projected caseload decline of 5.6 percent.

CASELOAD:

	2010-11	2011-12
Average Monthly Caseload	10,534	9,947
Federal Caseload	8,466	7,994
Nonfederal Caseload	2,068	1,953

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2010-11	2011-12
FFA – Basic Costs	Grant	Grant
Total	\$207,643	\$196,068
Federal	68,895	65,056
State	55,499	52,405
County	83,249	78,607
Reimbursements	0	0

Foster Family Agency – Basic Costs

EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
FFA– Federal	Grant	Grant
Total	\$154,571	\$145,958
Federal	68,895	65,056
State	34,270	32,361
County	51,406	48,541
Reimbursements	0	0
FFA – Nonfederal	Grant	Grant
Total	\$53,072	\$50,110
Federal	0	0
State	21,229	20,044
County	31,843	30,066
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Basic Costs

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the out-of-home board and care costs associated with children placed in accordance with the Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED) program. Assembly Bill (AB) 3632 (Chapter 1747, Statutes of 1984) and AB 882 (Chapter 1274, Statutes of 1985) authorized the SED program as a separate out-of-home care component. Eligible participants are children designated as SED by the California Department of Education (CDE).

Senate Bill 485 (Chapter 722, Statutes of 1992) modified the program by eliminating any California Department of Social Services participation in funding "for profit" facilities, shifting responsibility for the cost of children in those facilities to CDE and local education agencies.

Payments may be made on behalf of SED children placed in privately operated residential facilities licensed in accordance with the Community Care Facilities Act, and shall be based on foster care rates established in accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) sections 11460 to 11467, inclusive. Most SED children are placed in group home psychiatric peer group Rate Classification Levels 12 through 14; however, some children are placed in foster family homes or foster family agencies. As there is no court adjudication, these children are eligible only for nonfederal foster care program benefits.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1987.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC sections 18350-18356.
- Case months are based on trend caseload projections.
- Average grants are based on actual expenditure and caseload data for a 12 month period from January 2009 to December 2009. The projected average grant for Los Angeles County is \$5,564.66. The projected average grant for the remaining counties is \$5,825.75. The projected average grants were held to the 2010-11 Appropriation to reflect SED expenditure data before the Group Home and SED Rate Increase was implemented on December 14, 2009.
- The impact of the *California Alliance of Child and Family Services v. Cliff Allenby* court decision will be displayed in the Group Home and SED Rate Increase premise.

METHODOLOGY:

SED costs are the product of projected case months and the computed average grant. Program costs are the aggregate of separate projections for Los Angeles County and the remaining 57 counties.

FUNDING:

SED costs are shared 40 percent General Fund and 60 percent county funds.

Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Basic Costs

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The Current Year and Budget Year decrease reflects slower caseload growth than projected for the November 2010 Subvention.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This decrease reflects projected caseload decline.

CASELOAD:

	2010-11	2011-12
Average Monthly Caseload	1,797	1,768

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$123,878	\$121,862
Federal	0	0
State	49,551	48,745
County	74,327	73,117
Reimbursements	0	0

Shift Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Responsibility to CDE (Prop - 98)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects savings associated with shifting the responsibility of Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED) cases to the California Department of Education (CDE). This reduction was included as part of the 2011 May Revision, and reflects saving for the Budget Year (BY) only. The SED program is a separate out-of-home care component of the Foster Care system. Eligible participants are children designated as SED by the CDE. For more information, please see the SED Basic Cost premise description.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implements on July 1, 2011.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Average grants are based on actual expenditure and caseload data for a 12 month period from January 2009 to December 2009. The projected average grant for Los Angeles County is \$5,564.66. The projected average grant for the remaining counties is \$5,825.75.
- The projected average grants were held to the 2010-11 Appropriation to reflect SED expenditure data before the Group Home and SED Rate Increase was implemented on December 14, 2009.
- This estimate also impacts the Group Home and SED Rate Increase premise which reflects a 32 percent increase to SED grants and a California Necessities Index increase of 1.57 percent in the Current Year and 1.92 percent for the BY. For more information, please see the Group Home and SED Rate Increase premise description.
- The average monthly caseload for the SED program is 1,768 for the BY.
- The estimate assumes a SED administrative savings at a cost of \$95.31 per case.

METHODOLOGY:

SED savings are the product of projected case months and the computed average grant. Program costs are the aggregate of separate projections for Los Angeles County and the remaining 57 counties.

FUNDING:

The item 101 SED assistance savings is shared 40 percent General Fund (GF) and 60 percent county funds. The item 141 SED administrative savings is shared 70 GF and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

This is a new premise.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The SED savings is a BY item only.

Shift Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Responsibility to CDE (Prop - 98)

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

Item 101 – Shift SED Responsibility To CDE (Prop - 98)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$0	-\$121,862
Federal	0	0
State	0	-48,745
County	0	-73,117
Reimbursements	0	0

Item 101 – Shift SED Responsibility To CDE (Prop - 98) - Rate Increase

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$0	-\$44,658
Federal	0	0
State	0	-17,863
County	0	-26,795
Reimbursements	0	0

Item 141 – Shift SED Responsibility To CDE (Prop - 98)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$0	-\$2,022
Federal	0	0
State	0	-1,415
County	0	-607
Reimbursements	0	0

Supplemental Clothing Allowance

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects expenditures associated with an augmentation of \$100 per child to the existing clothing allowance program for children placed in Foster Family Homes (FFHs) or certified family homes of Foster Family Agencies (FFAs) for 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. Funds for the waiver counties are included in Item 153, Title IV-E Waiver.

Currently, counties have the authority to provide a clothing allowance, in addition to the basic foster care rate paid on behalf of eligible foster children. This premise reflects an augmentation to the current program funding level, allowing for an annual supplemental clothing allowance of \$100 per child with no county share of cost.

Counties that currently have clothing allowance expenditures are expected to maintain their current level of funding in the program. The additional state and federally funded clothing allowance is intended to supplement not supplant current spending levels.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 11461(f) (4) and 11463(g).
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The statewide annual supplemental clothing allowance will be \$100 per child.
- All FFH and FFA placements are eligible for the clothing allowance. The average monthly projected caseload is 28,302 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11, and 25,186 for FY 2011-12.
- The State Supplemental Clothing Allowance Program will be discontinued for all FFH cases in all 58 counties, beginning July 1, 2011, as a result of the FFH Rate Increase. For more information, please see the FFH Rate Increase premise description.
- All cases shifting to the Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment program are presumed to receive the clothing allowance prior to exiting foster care.
- The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

METHODOLOGY:

The counties expenditures for the statewide supplemental clothing allowance are a product of the projected cases and the \$100 allowance.

Supplemental Clothing Allowance

FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act for those cases meeting eligibility criteria, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP rate. Funding for the nonfederal share of federal program costs and for those cases not meeting federal eligibility criteria is 100 percent General Fund.

The Title IV-E FMAP rate was temporarily increased by 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. This increase was approved by the federal government to extend until June 30, 2011. This extension of the ARRA results in an increase of 3.2 percent for the third quarter of FY 2010-11 and an increase of 1.2 percent for the fourth quarter of FY 2010-11. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The Current Year change is a net impact of a slight increase in caseload offset by a projected decrease in the foster care federal discount rate. The Budget Year decrease is a result of lower caseload than was projected in the November 2010 Subvention.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This decrease reflects a decline in projected caseloads.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$2,830	\$2,518
Federal	1,003	897
State	1,827	1,621
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Title XX Funding

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the Title XX Social Services Block Grant awarded to the state as well as the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds that are transferred to Title XX. This funding is provided under Title XX of the federal Social Security Act as amended by the federal Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981. Federal funding for social services has been given to states under Title XX since October 1981. In order to qualify for these funds, a state must prepare an expenditure plan prior to the start of the state fiscal year that is consistent with the five Title XX goals:

1. Achieving or maintaining economic self-support to prevent, reduce, or eliminate dependency.
2. Achieving or maintaining self-sufficiency, including reduction or prevention of dependency.
3. Preventing or remedying neglect, abuse or exploitation of children or adults unable to protect their own interests; or preserving, rehabilitating or reuniting families.
4. Preventing or reducing inappropriate institutional care by providing for community-based care, home-based care, or other forms of less intensive care.
5. Securing referral or admission for institutional care when other forms of care are not appropriate or providing services to individuals in institutions.

Through Fiscal Year (FY) 1992-93, Title XX funds were used exclusively to fund the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) program. With the implementation of the Title XIX Personal Care Services Program in 1993, a portion of the Title XX funds was shifted to other eligible programs. Those funds now support the following programs:

- Foster Care services (goal 3);
- Child Welfare Services (CWS) (goals 3 and 4); and
- Deaf Access Program (goals 1 and 2);

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 13000 through 13008.
- State legislation permits Title XX funds to be used in CWS and Foster Care to supplant the state share without affecting county funds.
- The Title XX funding awarded to California is \$150.9 million for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010 and FFY 2011. \$366 million in TANF grant dollars in FY 2010-11 and \$364.6 million in TANF grant dollars in FY 2011-12 will be transferred to Title XX.
- The FFY awards are adjusted to conform to FY funding needs.

METHODOLOGY:

- In the Current Year (CY) \$32.9 million in TANF grant dollars will be transferred into the Title XX Block Grant to fund services for children residing in group homes in non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. The funds decrease to \$30.3 million in the Budget Year (BY) for the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.

Title XX Funding

METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

- In the CY, \$21.5 million in TANF grant dollars will be transferred into the Title XX Block Grant to fund services for children residing in group homes in the Title IV-E Waiver counties. The funds decrease to \$21.5 million in the BY for the Title IV-E Waiver counties. The estimated available Title XX to transfer to TANF grant dollars assumes the impact of the Group Home and Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED) Rate Increase.
- In the CY and the BY, \$147.9 million in Title XX funds are being shifted to the Department of Developmental Services (DDS).
- TANF funds are transferred to Title XX for the following purposes: \$42.2 million in the CY and \$39.2 million in the BY for non-Title IV-E Waiver counties, and \$24.2 million for the CY and BY for the Title IV-E Waiver counties to supplant a portion of the state share of CWS eligible expenditures in the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), and \$77.2 million for the CY and BY are added to the Title XX funds shifted to DDS.
- In the Deaf Access Program, \$3.0 million in Title XX block grant funds for both the CY and the BY will reduce the General Fund (GF) share in an otherwise 100 percent GF program.
- In the CY and the BY, \$20.0 million of TANF funds may be transferred to Title XX for child care: \$10 million for CDSS' Stage One Child Care program and \$10 million for the California Department of Education's child care programs, in order to broaden access to Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) benefits for low-income children in proprietary child care centers. The CY and the BY reflect an additional TANF Title XX amount of \$158 million and \$162.4 million respectively to fund Stage One Child Care.

FUNDING:

Title XX is a federal block grant that does not require a state or county match.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The Title XX transfer from TANF for Foster Care in the CY and the BY has decreased to reflect actual expenditures and estimated premise impacts. The Title XX transfer from TANF to Stage One Child Care has increased due to a decrease in needed Tribal TANF funds, which in turn, increases the amount of TANF available to transfer to Title XX.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The overall decrease in TANF funds transferred to Title XX is due to increased Tribal TANF costs in the BY. The overall increase in the amount of TANF transferred to Stage One Child Care through Title XX is due to a decrease in Title XX-eligible costs for CWS and Foster Care in the BY.

Title XX Funding

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total Title XX	\$516,861	\$515,544
Title XX Grant	150,899	150,899
TANF Transfer In	365,962	364,645
 Foster Care (Transfer from TANF)		
 Item 101		
Federal	\$32,927	\$30,303
State	-32,927	-30,303
 Item 153		
Federal	\$21,477	\$21,473
State	-21,477	-21,473
 CWS Transfer to DDS (Item 151)	\$225,060	\$ 225,060
 <u>Transfer from Title XX Grant</u>		
Federal	147,903	147,903
State	0	0
 <u>Transfer from TANF</u>		
Federal	77,157	77,157
State	0	0

Title XX Funding

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
For CWS (Transfer from TANF)		
Item 151		
Federal	\$42,221	\$39,160
State	-42,221	-39,160
Item 153		
Federal	\$24,150	\$24,150
State	-24,150	-24,150
Deaf Access (Item 151)		
Federal	\$2,996	\$2,996
State	-2,996	-2,996
CalWORKs Child Care (TANF Reconciliation)		
Federal	-168,029	-172,402
State	0	0

Supportive Transitional Emancipation Program

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide financial support to emancipating foster youth up to age 21 if participating in an educational or training program or any activity consistent with their "transitional independent living plan." These payments are authorized by Assembly Bill 427 (Chapter 125, Statutes of 2001) which added Section 11403.1 to the Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC). This premise also reflects the administrative costs for updating the Transitional Independent Living Plan and determining the eligibility of applicants for the Supportive Transitional Emancipation Program.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was effective on January 1, 2002; however no counties have implemented the program.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC section 11403.1
- There are no counties planning to participate in the program at this time.
- Trailer bill language limits participation in this program subject to the availability of funds in the current Budget Act.

METHODOLOGY:

There are no counties planning to participate in the program at this time.

FUNDING:

There are no counties planning to participate in the program at this time.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

Supportive Transitional Emancipation Program

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

101 – Assistance Payments – STEP	2010-11 Grant	2011-12 Grant
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Item 141 – STEP Eligibility	2010-11 County Admin.	2011-12 County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Item 151 – STEP Plan Activity	2010-11 County Admin.	2011-12 County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Emergency Assistance Program

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the Emergency Assistance (EA) Foster Care (FC) programs, which provide funding for benefits and services granted to children and families in emergency situations. Eligibility is restricted to one episode in any 12-month period. The EA-FC Welfare program provides support payments for dependents and voluntary FC placements not otherwise eligible for federal Title IV-E benefits. The "Child Welfare Services-Emergency Assistance" premise discusses additional program components.

Public Law (P.L.) 104-193 eliminated Title IV-A funding for the EA program but permitted use of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) dollars for EA funding. Although P.L. 104-193 allowed TANF funding for this portion of the EA program, the Budget Act of 1997 replaced the TANF funding with General Fund (GF). Based on interpretation of the final TANF regulations, that EA GF expenditures are not countable towards the TANF maintenance of effort requirement, effective October 1, 1999, the GF was replaced with TANF funding.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The EA-FC Welfare program became effective September 1, 1993.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10101.
- Based on actual expenditure and caseload data through December 2010, the projected average grant for EA-FC cases is \$1,444.61
- EA case months are projected using a five-month linear trend forecast based on actual caseload data.
- The Current Year (CY) EA administrative costs have been updated based on actual claims.
- Foster children receiving EA benefits are eligible to receive the \$100 supplemental clothing allowance.

METHODOLOGY:

- **Item 101** – EA-FC costs are the product of projected case months and the computed average grant, plus the cost of the supplemental clothing allowance for each case.
- **Item 141** – Costs for administrative activities performed by County Welfare Department staff are based upon actual expenditures and adjusted for caseload growth in Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and FY 2011-12. Administrative costs also include \$35,000 added to the federal share for reimbursements to the California Department of Health Services for data processing activities associated with the Assistance to Children in Emergency System, which enables tracking of EA cases currently receiving assistance.

FUNDING:

EA funding was used in the TANF block grant calculation and, therefore, is part of the TANF funding schedule.

Effective October 1, 1999, the EA-FC component is funded 70 percent TANF, 30 percent county, and the EA administrative costs are funded 85 percent TANF and 15 percent county.

The supplemental clothing allowance component is funded 100 percent with TANF.

Emergency Assistance Program

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The CY and Budget Year (BY) Item 101 increase is the result of higher caseload than was projected in the November 2010 Subvention.

The CY administrative cost was held to Appropriation. The BY administrative costs increase is based on actual expenditures.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The Item 101 change reflects a projected increase in caseload.
The administrative costs are updated based on actual expenditures.

CASELOAD:

	2010-11	2011-12
Average Monthly Caseload	3,770	3,815

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

ITEMS 101 & 141 – EA

	2010-11		2011-12	
	Grant	County Admin.	Grant	County Admin.
Total	\$65,730	\$6,328	\$66,512	\$6,402
Federal	0	0	0	0
State	46,124	5,384	46,673	5,447
County	19,606	944	19,839	955
Reimbursements	0	0	0	0

Expansion of Eligibility for the Intensive Treatment Foster Care (ITFC) Program (SB 1380)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings associated with expanding the number of children eligible for the Intensive Treatment Foster Care (ITFC) program in the 56 non-waiver counties, by including youth with serious behavioral problems that would otherwise be placed in more costly group home settings.

Senate Bill (SB) 1380 authorizes the expansion of eligibility of children and services for the ITFC program by increasing the types of services that Foster Family Agencies would be required to provide or arrange for under the program. The overall purpose of ITFC is to provide a home-like placement alternative for children and youth with significant behavior challenges. This premise will also require revisions to eligibility, operational, reporting, and foster parent training components of the ITFC program.

The ITFC premise seeks to improve outcomes for foster youth by providing less restrictive environments for children, and allows the counties to determine which children from the expanded eligible population in Group Homes (GH) with Rate Classification Levels (RCLs) 9-11 will be placed in ITFC programs.

This premise limits the number of children able to participate in the ITFC program to 750 in the first three years (excluding counties participating in the Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration Project). This limitation will allow time to determine if the expansion of eligibility, pursuant to this premise, produces the desired outcome of reducing the GH population, in keeping with the state's public policy goals.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on July 1, 2011

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: SB 1380 (Chapter 486, Statutes of 2008)
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- Twenty cases were assumed as the initial monthly caseload.
- Twenty additional cases were added each successive month until the 750 limit is reached.
- The RCLs 9-11 rate reflect the impact of the 32 percent GH and Seriously Emotionally Disturbed rate increase, as well as a California Necessities Index (CNI) adjustment of 1.57 percent for the Current Year (CY) and 1.92 percent for the Budget Year (BY).
- The rates of \$6,956 for the average of RCLs 9-11 and \$4,101 for the average of ITFC Rates A-C are used to calculate potential savings.

Expansion of Eligibility for the Intensive Treatment Foster Care (ITFC) Program (SB 1380)

METHODOLOGY:

The estimated savings were the product of casemonths multiplied by the difference between the average rate based on ITFC Rates A-C less the average rate for RCL 9-11 cases.

FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of federal financial participation based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 percent General Fund and 60 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The BY change is a net result of an updated CNI offset by a shift of cases moving from federal to non-federal cases.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in the BY.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	0	-\$4,455
Federal	0	-992
State	0	-1,385
County	0	-2,078
Reimbursements	0	0

Foster Care and AAP Overpayments

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with Title IV-E Foster Care (FC) and Adoption Assistance Payment (AAP) Overpayments. The federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Region IX has notified the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) that the federal share of Title IV-E overpayments identified through state audits performed on group homes and the share of Title IV-E overpayments identified through county overpayments must be returned immediately once the overpayment has been identified as required by federal regulations. The practice has been to repay the federal share upon recoupment from foster care providers. Therefore, DHHS has issued a demand for repayment for the federal share of all state and county overpayments identified regardless of whether or not CDSS collects the overpayment.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

Adjustments to federal claim began in Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- This estimate reflects costs for the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver FC counties, and the 58 county AAP program from July 1, 2007.
- Beginning July 1, 2009, counties will begin paying their share of the reported overpayments.

METHODOLOGY:

Overpayments are estimated based on actual county claims.

FUNDING:

Senate Bill 84 (Chapter 177, Statutes of 2007) requires that General Fund (GF) will pay the full federal share of all uncollected overpayments until regulations have been adopted, after which counties will be required to share at the normal non-federal foster care sharing ratios. Funding for the repayment of the federal Title IV-E overpayments will be 40 percent GF and 60 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

FC - The Current Year (CY) decrease in costs is based on actual FC claims. The Budget Year (BY) decrease reflects a decline in FC caseload

AAP – The CY increase in cost is based on actual AAP claims. The BY increase reflects an increase in AAP caseload.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

FC - This decrease is the result of a projected decline in the overall FC caseload.

AAP- This increase is the result of a projected increase in the overall AAP caseload.

Foster Care and AAP Overpayments

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

ITEM 101 – FC Payments	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$868	\$775
Federal	0	0
State	347	310
County	521	465
Reimbursements	0	0
ITEM 101 – AAP Payments	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$588	\$604
Federal	0	0
State	441	453
County	147	151
Reimbursements	0	0

Multi-Treatment Foster Care (MTFC) Program

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings associated with expanding the number of children enrolled in the Multi-Treatment Foster Care (MTFC) program in the 56 non-waiver counties, that would otherwise be placed in more costly group home settings. The MTFC program is an evidence-based model of treatment foster care for children with severe emotional and behavioral disorders and/or severe delinquency. This model aims to create opportunities for youths to successfully live in families rather than in group or institutional settings. The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) has endorsed this model as a best practice for providing foster children with permanency and child/family well-being. CDSS is encouraging development of this model as part of the Program Improvement Plan (PIP).

Senate Bill (SB) 1380 (Chapter 486, Statutes of 2008), provides counties the authority to pursue MTFC programs and to work with shareholders to establish MTFC rates. Currently, implementation of the MTFC model is hampered by the challenges associated with setting appropriate MTFC rates. Several counties are currently utilizing the Intensive Treatment Foster Care (ITFC) rates to fund care and supervision for their MTFC programs, because the ITFC rate offers a higher payment for the foster parent to compensate for the extra care and supervision required by foster care providers. Counties must find additional funding beyond Aid to Families with Dependent Children–Foster Care (AFDC-FC) and Medi-Cal to close the gap between allowable AFDC-FC fundable activities and the funding necessary to pay for activities that are part of the MTFC model. Typically, the populations served in MTFC are children who are usually placed in Group Home (GH) Rate Classification Level (RCL) 12 or above and have a myriad of behavioral disorders and require an intense level of care and supervision from the foster parent.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on July 1, 2011

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- This estimate reflects cost/savings for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The cases presumed to be eligible for federal and nonfederal MTFC program benefits are based on a maximum of 335 children from GH RCL 12 through 14.
- Five new cases per month are phased into the program upon implementation.
- The RCLs 12 through 14 rate reflect the impact of the 32 percent GH and Seriously Emotionally Disturbed rate increase, as well as a cost of living (COLA) adjustment of 1.57 percent in the Current Year (CY) and 1.92 percent for the Budget Year (BY).
- The following rates of RCL 12, \$8,050, RCL 14, \$9,147, and ITFC Range A, \$4,476, were used to calculate costs/savings.
- Federal and nonfederal case costs not covered by Title IV-E were estimated at \$350 per case per month.

Multi-Treatment Foster Care (MTFC) Program

METHODOLOGY:

The basic costs were the product of federal and nonfederal casemonths multiplied by the rates associated with RCL levels 12 and 14, which were then compared to the identical casemonths multiplied by the rates associated with the existing ITFC Range A rate. Additional federal and nonfederal case services/costs not covered under Title IV-E funding were calculated on the overall number of cases to offset the savings calculated between ITFC Range A rates and RCL rates.

FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of federal financial participation based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 percent General Fund and 60 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The BY change is a net result of an updated COLA offset by a shift of cases moving from federal to non-federal cases.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in the BY.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$0	-\$1,325
Federal	0	-378
State	0	-379
County	0	-568
Reimbursements	0	0

Educational Stability (P.L. 110-351)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with reimbursing foster caregivers for travel expenses related to educational travel. The Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act (P.L. 110-351) requires states to develop a plan to ensure the educational stability of a child in foster care. Part of meeting the educational stability requirement is for the placement decision to take into account the appropriateness of the current educational setting and the proximity to the school in which the child is enrolled at the time of placement. P.L. 110-351 authorizes the use of Title IV-E funds to pay for reasonable travel to the child's school of origin.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2010.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act (P.L. 110-351).
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- For Fiscal Year FY 2010-11, the estimated number of school age children whose placement is outside of their school district of origin is 9,503. For FY 2011-12, the estimated number of school age children whose placement is outside of their school district of origin is 8,457.
- This premise includes children that have an Individual Education Plan (IEP).
- This premise excludes all Group Home children.
- This estimate assumes the AAA average driving cost of 32 cents per mile. The AAA rate includes costs for gas, vehicle maintenance, tires, insurance, and license/registration/taxes.
- This estimate assumes that 83 percent of the total school age foster care population will utilize a five-tier flat rate system. Of this population, 36.6 percent of children will be driven between 1-5 miles per day, one way to school, 16.8 percent of children will be driven between 6-10 miles per day, one way to school, and 46.6 percent of children will be driven 11 or more miles per day, one way to school. It is assumed that four one way trips will be made each day, per child.
- This estimate assumes the remaining 17 percent of the total school age foster care population will use public transportation at a flat rate of \$44 per child per month.
- This estimate assumes an average of 180 school days annually.
- This estimate assumes 15 minutes of social worker time to calculate the amount of educational travel that foster parents are to receive.
- This estimate assumes the hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

Foster Care – 101

The annual cost is calculated by multiplying the impacted caseload by the applicable mileage range and flat rate as identified above for 180 school days. For FY 2010-11 the number of school days is 90 based on a January 1, 2010 implementation date. For FY 2011-12 the number of school days is the annual 180.

Educational Stability (P.L. 110-351)

METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

Automation – 141

Additional costs may be budgeted for updating the automation systems to accommodate the requirements of P.L. 110-351 with regards to reasonable travel.

CWS - 151

The cost is determined by multiplying the hourly cost of a social worker by the caseload, then multiplying by the time per case to determine the amount of educational travel reimbursement.

FUNDING:

Foster Care – 101

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of Federal Financial Participation (FFP) based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Nonfederal costs are shared 40 percent General Fund (GF) and 60 percent county.

Title IV-E FMAP rate temporarily increased by 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. This increase was approved by the federal government to extend until June 30, 2011. This extension of the ARRA results in an increase of 3.2 percent for the third quarter of FY 2010-11 and an increase of 1.2 percent for the fourth quarter of FY 2010-11. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

CWS - 151

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The Current Year and Budget Year cost decrease is due to lower caseload than projected.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This decrease is due to a projected caseload decline in the Foster Family Home and Foster Family Agency placements.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

Item 101 – Foster Care	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$20,596	\$18,329
Federal	6,821	6,077
State	5,510	4,901
County	8,265	7,351
Reimbursements	0	0

Educational Stability (P.L. 110-351)

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

Item 141	2010-11	2011-12
Automation		
Total	\$0	\$600
Federal	0	300
State	0	300
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Item 151	2010-11	2011-12
CWS		
Total	\$173	\$153
Federal	59	52
State	80	71
County	34	30
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Group Home and SED Rate Increase

DESCRIPTION:

This premise was ordered by the *California Alliance of Child and Family Services v. Cliff Allenby* court decision. This lawsuit challenged the sufficiency of Foster Care maintenance payments made to Group Home providers. It alleged that California Group Home rates did not fully reimburse Group Home providers for the cost associated with caring for foster children placed in their facilities. The court ruled against the state which has resulted in approximately a 32 percent increase in the rates for all Group Homes and Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED) placements statewide, retroactive to December 14, 2009.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on December 14, 2009.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: *California Alliance of Child and Family Services v. Cliff Allenby* court decision.
- This estimate reflects costs for all the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties, the Title IV-E Waiver counties, and SED for 58 counties.
- Includes a cost of living (COLA) adjustment of 1.57 percent for the entire Current Year (CY) and 1.92 percent for the entire Budget Year (BY). The COLA is based on the California Necessities Index (CNI).

METHODOLOGY:

The SED costs are calculated by increasing the Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 average grants by 32 percent, and a COLA of 1.57 percent was included in the average grant beginning July 1, 2010. In FY 2011-12, a COLA of 1.92 percent is included in the average grant beginning July 1, 2011.

The Group Home costs for the 56 non-Title IV-E waiver counties are calculated by increasing the FY 2010-11 average grants by 32 percent, and a COLA of 1.57 percent was included in the average grant beginning July 1, 2010. In FY 2011-12, a COLA of 1.92 percent is included in the average grant beginning July 1, 2011.

The Title IV-E waiver county estimates are calculated by increasing the FY 2010-11 average grants, for both Los Angeles County and Alameda County, by 32 percent, and a COLA of 1.57 percent was included in the average grant beginning July 1, 2010. In FY 2011-12, a COLA of 2.29 percent is included in their average grant beginning July 1, 2011. The impact of the estimated additional availability of Title XX funds are incorporated into the federal and General Fund (GF) costs. Federal participation in the increased costs is contingent on federal approval. Title IV-E Waiver estimates have been predetermined and are still pending federal approval.

FUNDING:

SED costs are shared 40 percent GF and 60 percent county funds.

Group Home federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of Federal Financial Participation based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 percent GF and 60 percent county.

Group Home and SED Rate Increase

FUNDING (CONTINUED):

Title IV-E FMAP rate was temporarily increased by 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. This increase was approved by the federal government to extend until June 30, 2011. This extension of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) results in an increase of 3.2 percent for the third quarter of FY 2010-11 and an increase of 1.2 percent for the fourth quarter of FY 2010-11. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The CY decrease is a result of lower projected caseload for the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. The BY decrease reflects a further decline of caseload as well as an updated CNI.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This decrease is a net result of a projected caseload decrease in Group Home and SED placements offset by an updated BY CNI.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

Item 101 - Total

	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$160,629	\$159,671
Federal	26,363	25,605
State	53,706	53,626
County	80,560	80,440
Reimbursements	0	0

Item 101 – Group Home - 56 county

	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$118,421	\$115,013
Federal	26,363	25,605
State	36,823	35,763
County	55,235	53,645
Reimbursements	0	0

Group Home and SED Rate Increase

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

Item 101 - SED	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$42,208	\$44,658
Federal	0	0
State	16,883	17,863
County	25,325	26,795
Reimbursements	0	0

Item 153	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$50,416	\$51,028
Federal	13,628	13,695
State	11,178	11,378
County	25,610	25,955
Reimbursements	0	0

Item 153 – Title XX – GH Rate Increase (Non Add Line)

	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	4,619	4,615
State	-4,619	-4,615
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Residentially Based Services (AB 1453)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise provides up-front funding for residential foster care services for children/youth enrolled in the Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project. Assembly Bill (AB) 1453 (Chapter 466, Statutes of 2007) authorized a five-year pilot demonstration project to test alternative RBS program and funding models which are cost neutral to the General Fund (GF). The results of the pilot projects are intended to guide the design of a statewide plan for RBS implementation that is to be provided to the Legislature by July 1, 2014.

The RBS Reform Project is designed to transform the state's current system of long-term, congregate, group home care into a system of RBS programs which provide short-term, intensive, residential treatment interventions along with community-based services and post-residential placement support and services to reconnect foster children/youth to their families and communities. The goal of RBS is to reduce lengths of stay in high-end group care and increase permanency for youth who would otherwise grow up in the foster care system. In order to achieve these goals, high cost, short-term, intensive services need to be front-loaded while the child/youth is residing in the RBS group home. By front-loading services it is anticipated that the children/youth enrolled in RBS will require shorter lengths of stay in the high-cost residential facilities and step down to lower levels of care more quickly, resulting in cost savings over the life of the child/youth's foster care stay. The RBS Reform Project is also included as a primary strategy in the California Program Improvement Plan for sustaining and enhancing permanency efforts.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on June 28, 2010.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: AB 1453 (Chapter 466, Statutes of 2007) and Welfare and Institutions Code section 18987.7.
 - Up to four counties may participate in the pilot. Currently, four counties have submitted plans to participate in the pilot project. They are San Francisco County, Sacramento County, Los Angeles County, and San Bernardino County. Each site has developed a unique RBS program design and funding model.
 - This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
 - Depending on the specific pilot program design, short-term intensive residential services will be needed for an average of 12 months or less, followed by lower cost placement in the community or placement into a permanent home.
 - Without RBS, these youth would have remained in Rate Classification Level (RCL) 12-14 group homes. The rate for RCL level 12 is \$7,917 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and \$8,069 for FY 2011-12. The rate for RCL level 14 is \$8,974 for FY 2010-11 and \$9,146 for FY 2011-12.
 - The GF savings associated with the Adoption Assistance Program (AAP) De-Link will be used to offset the costs of this premise. For additional information, see the AAP De-Link (P.L.110-351) Premise.
 - This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) increases are included in this estimate.
-

Residentially Based Services (AB 1453)

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- The overall RBS project sunset date was extended to January 1, 2015.

San Bernardino County

- The San Bernardino County pilot began June 28, 2010 with a maximum capacity of 12 RBS beds.
- The approved RBS rate is \$8,835 and the Community Based Services (CBS) rates are as follows: Phase I - Intensive Treatment Foster Care, \$4,028, Phase I - Foster Family Agency \$1,679; Phase II - Wraparound services \$3,571.
- Approximately 72 percent of the foster youth are eligible for federal funding.
- It is assumed that the youth will spend approximately 12 months in the RBS setting and an additional 12 months in the CBS setting; six months in Phase I and an additional six months in Phase II.
- The average length of stay in a group home is 32 months.

Sacramento County

- The Sacramento County pilot began August 15, 2010 with a maximum capacity of 22 RBS beds.
- The approved RBS rate is \$8,031 and the CBS rate is \$4,594.
- Approximately 73 percent of the foster youth are eligible for federal funding.
- It is assumed that the youth will spend approximately nine months in the RBS setting and an additional nine months in the CBS setting.
- The average length of stay in a group home is 26 months.

San Francisco County

- The San Francisco County pilot began March 1, 2011 with a maximum capacity of 18 RBS beds.
- The approved RBS rate is \$11,000 and the CBS rate is \$4,028 for Phase I and \$3,500 for Phase II.
- Approximately 75 percent of the foster youth are eligible for federal funding.
- It is assumed that the youth will spend an average of five months in the RBS setting and an additional 19 months in the CBS setting, six months in an ITFC setting and an additional 13 months in an CBS setting.
- The average length of stay in a group home is 24 months.

METHODOLOGY:

To determine the cost of the project, caseloads for each pilot project are converted to case months in each setting which are multiplied by the RBS monthly rate and the CBS rate, respectively. These costs are compared with the costs that would otherwise have been incurred for the same child in the appropriate group home setting. The difference represents the cost of the project.

Residentially Based Services (AB 1453)

FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of federal financial participation based on FMAP for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 percent GF and 60 percent county.

The Title IV-E FMAP rate temporarily increased by 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. This increase was approved by the federal government to extend until June 30, 2011. This extension of the ARRA results in an increase of 3.2 percent for the third quarter of FY 2010-11 and an increase of 1.2 percent for the fourth quarter of FY 2010-11.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The Current Year and Budget Year erosion of savings is due to a two month delay in implementation for San Francisco County.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increased savings reflects cases moving into a lesser restrictive environment that receives a lower CBS rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	-\$136	-\$3,241
Federal	-184	-1,704
State	19	-615
County	29	-922
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Federal Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program (AB 12)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the federal Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (Fed-GAP) program. This program is authorized by Assembly Bill (AB) 12 (Chapter 559, Statutes of 2010), which exercised the federal option contained in Public Law (P.L.) 110-351, the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008, which permits states to opt into a new kinship guardianship payment program eligible for federal financial participation (FFP). In order to be eligible for FFP, the federal law requires a written agreement with the relative be entered into for new cases; that subsidized guardianship payments continue regardless of state of residence; and, renegotiations of payment are based on the needs of the child and the circumstances of the relative. Additionally, before a relative guardian may receive a Title IV-E subsidized guardianship agreement, a child must have been in an approved or licensed relative home for six consecutive months prior to guardianship.

Effective January 1, 2011, current Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (Kin-GAP) program cases that are federal Title IV-E eligible will convert to the Fed-GAP program upon annual redetermination. Prospective federally eligible cases that would have entered the Kin-GAP program on or after January 1, 2011, will now enter the Fed-GAP program.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement January 1, 2011.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: AB 12, P.L. 110-351.
- The average Fed-GAP grant payment is based on the average Kin-GAP grant payment, which is then increased due to 15 percent of federally eligible Kin-GAP cases qualifying for enhanced benefits, which previously were ineligible to receive such benefits, upon reassessment. The average Fed-GAP grant payment is \$682.02.
- The impact of the California Foster Parent Association, et al vs. John A. Wagner court decision that increases the FFH basic rate will be displayed in the FFH Rate Increase – FFH Impact premise.
- It is projected that on December 31, 2010, there will be 12,656 federally eligible Kin-GAP cases that will convert to the Fed-GAP program. The conversion will occur on the date of the annual redetermination. Assuming the date of the redetermination is spread out evenly over the course of one year, 1,055 cases will leave Kin-GAP each month for twelve months. Of the 1,055 monthly cases, 213 cases will discontinue. The number of discontinuances is based on a twelve month average of discontinued Kin-GAP cases reported on the CA 237 Kin-GAP Caseload Movement Report. Therefore, 842 converted cases will enter Fed-GAP each month.
- Assumes 132 new cases will enter Fed-GAP each month. This is based on a 12 month average of Title IV-E eligible cases entering Kin-GAP from Foster Care reported on the CA 237 Kin-GAP Caseload Movement Report.

Federal Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program (AB 12)

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Administrative costs for new Fed-GAP cases assumes two hours to complete an initial assessment, comprised of the execution of the Kin-GAP agreement and additional documentation in the case plan. The cost for these two hours is \$72.60 per hour. Administrative costs for converted Fed-GAP cases assume six hours, which include the two hours to complete an initial assessment, as well as one hour for determining Title IV-E eligibility, and three hours of social worker time to visit the home of the guardian. The cost for these six hours is \$72.60 per hour.
- State and county expenditures associated with Fed-GAP cases are not eligible for the state's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement.
- The amount of FFP is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

METHODOLOGY:

Fed-GAP basic costs are the product of the projected casemonths and the average grant, as identified above.

Fed-GAP administrative costs are the product of the projected cases by the applicable hours per case.

FUNDING:

The Fed-GAP program will be paid with 50 percent federal funding, provided under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP rate. The balance of the nonfederal costs will be paid with 79 percent General Fund (GF) and 21 percent county funds.

Title IV-E FMAP rate temporarily increased by 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. This increase was approved by the federal government to extend until June 30, 2011. This extension of the ARRA results in an increase of 3.2 percent for the third quarter of FY 2010-11 and an increase of 1.2 percent for the fourth quarter of FY 2010-11. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

For administrative costs, the federal portion will be 50 percent of the federal discount rate (66 percent), with the remaining balance paid with GF.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The Current Year (CY) and Budget Year (BY) decrease is an overall impact of a decrease in projected cases entering the program coupled with a projected increase of discontinued Kin-GAP cases.

The Admin was held to Appropriation in the CY. The BY decrease reflects a decline in caseload.

Federal Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program (AB 12)

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This increase reflects a full year of costs in the Budget Year.

CASELOAD:

	2010-11	2011-12
Average Monthly Caseload	3,424	10,375

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

Item 101 – Fed-GAP Basic Costs

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$14,010	\$84,914
Federal	7,005	42,457
State	5,534	33,541
County	1,471	8,916
Reimbursements	0	0

Item 141 – Fed-GAP Administration

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$2,397	\$2,437
Federal	803	804
State	1,594	1,633
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Reassessment Eligibility Relief - AB 1905

DESCRIPTION:

Currently, state law mandates that there must be annual reassessments of foster family homes for both relative and nonrelative extended family members. Anytime a foster family is in the process of undergoing an annual reassessment visit that may result in a late reassessment completion, families with Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC) payments are suspended until reassessment is completed. While their AFDC-FC payments are suspended, foster families have no other recourse except to file for California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) aid. Counties must then process CalWORKs applications, enroll families in the program, and then disenroll them once AFDC-FC payments are restored after the home reassessment is complete.

Pursuant to the provisions of Assembly Bill (AB) 1905, this premise reflects the requirement that the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) allow foster family relative or nonrelative extended family member to continue to receive AFDC-FC payments during their annual home reassessment process. This bill requires that payments to foster family relative or nonrelative extended family member will not be delayed or terminated due to late completion in the annual home reassessment process. The existing approval shall remain in force. This bill eliminates the need for counties to enroll these foster families in the CalWORKs program, and then disenroll them once AFDC-FC payments are restored.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2011.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 11402.4 (AB 1905 Chapter 562, Statutes of 2010)

Foster Care – 101

- This premise assumes implementation in January 2011 which will result in six months of cost to AFDC-FC in Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and a full year of cost in FY 2011-12.
- This AFDC-FC estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. Title IV-E Waiver costs are reflected in the Title IV-E Waiver premise. For more information please see the Title IV-E Waiver premise write-up.
- The AFDC-FC caseload presumed to be eligible is 7.5 percent of the Child Welfare Service (CWS) services-only cases based on a six month period ending December 2010.
- Federally eligible cases are projected to account for 100 percent of total CWS services-only placements.
- This AFDC-FC estimate assumed that a total of 343 AFDC-FC relative cases per month will have a late home reassessment, of which 148 cases per month will impact the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. The remaining cases are reflected in the item 153 Title IV-E Waiver premise.

Reassessment Eligibility Relief - AB 1905

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Federal average grant computations utilized caseload and expenditure data reported by the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties on the CA 237 FC during the most recent 17 month period ending November 2010. The projected federal grant is \$711.63.
- Based on actual Foster Care (FC) expenditure data the projected administrative grant is \$95.31 per case.

CalWORKs – 101

- This bill eliminates the need for counties to enroll foster families in the CalWORKs program while processing an annual reassessment in foster care. As a result, it will generate administrative and grant savings to CalWORKs.
- This premise assumes implementation in January 2011 which will result in six months of savings to CalWORKs in FY 2010-11 and a full year of savings in FY 2011-12.
- It is assumed that approximately 343 cases per month will not enter CalWORKs as a result of those cases staying in foster care during their annual reassessment.
- It is assumed that the average CalWORKs grant savings is approximately \$382 per case in FY 2010-11 and approximately \$351 per case in FY 2011-12 (which reflects the CalWORKs grant reduction that implements on July 1, 2011).
- It is assumed that the monthly CalWORKs administrative savings is \$33.58 per case.

METHODOLOGY:

Foster Care – 101

The FC assistance payments for this premise is the product of projected federal case months multiplied by the average grant, as identified above.

FY 2010-11: (\$711.63 per case x 148 cases x 6 months = \$0.634 million)

FY 2011-12: (\$711.63 per case x 148 cases x 12 months = \$1.27 million)

Foster Care – 141

The FC administrative cost for this premise is the product of projected federal case months multiplied by the average grant, as identified above.

FY 2010-11: (\$95.31 per case x 148 cases x 6 months = \$0.084 million)

FY 2011-12: (\$95.31 per case x 148 cases x 12 months = \$0.167 million)

CalWORKs – 101

The total CalWORKs grant savings as a result of AB 1905 is calculated by multiplying the average grant by projected cases impacted.

Reassessment Eligibility Relief - AB 1905

METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

FY 2010-11: (\$382 per case x 343 cases x 6 months = \$0.7 million)
FY 2011-12: (\$351 per case x 343 cases x 12 months = \$1.4 million)

The total CalWORKs administrative savings as a result of AB 1905 is calculated by multiplying the projected cases impacted by the average administrative cost.

FY 2010-11: (\$33.58 EW x 343 cases x 6 months = \$0.07 million)
FY 2011-12: (\$33.58 EW x 343 cases x 12 months = \$0.13 million)

FUNDING:

Foster Care – 101

Federal funding is provided for by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of Federal Financial Participation (FFP) based on the 50 percent Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the federal program costs is 40 percent General Fund (GF) and 60 percent county.

The Title IV-E FMAP rate temporarily increased by 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. This increase was approved by the federal government to extend until June 30, 2011. This extension of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act 2009 (ARRA) results in an increase of 3.2 percent for the third quarter of FY 2010-11 and an increase of 1.2 percent for the fourth quarter of FY 2010-11. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

Foster Care – 141

Costs for FC administrative activities are shared at 50 percent FFP with the remainder split at 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

CalWORKs – 101

Funding for CalWORKs grants are 97.5 percent federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds and 2.5 percent county share. Funding for CalWORKs administration are 100 percent federal TANF funds.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

FC - There is no change for Current Year (CY) and Budget Year (BY). For CalWORKs, the change in the CY and BY is due to an increase in projected cases impacted by this policy and updated grant amounts.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

FC - This change reflects a full year of implementation. For CalWORKs, the change reflects a full year of implementation.

Reassessment Eligibility Relief - AB 1905

Expenditures:

(in 000's)

Foster Care - Item 101 Grants

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$634	\$1,266
Federal	317	633
State	127	253
County	190	380
Reimbursements	0	0

Foster Care - Item 141 Admin

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$84	\$167
Federal	42	84
State	29	58
County	13	25
Reimbursements	0	0

CalWORKs – Grants

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	-\$787	-\$1,446
Federal	-767	-1,410
State	0	0
County	-20	-36
Reimbursements	0	0

CalWORKs – Admin

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	-\$69	-\$138
Federal	-67	-135
State	-2	-3
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Adoption Assistance Program – Basic Costs

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the basic cost of providing financial support to families adopting a child with special needs under the Adoption Assistance Program (AAP).

Children eligible for AAP benefits have one of the following characteristics that are barriers to adoption: mental, physical, medical or emotional handicap; ethnic background, race, color, or language; over three years of age; member of a sibling group to be adopted by one family; or adverse parental background (e.g., drug addiction, mental illness). To be eligible to receive federal benefits, the child shall have been otherwise eligible to receive aid under the federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care program. The amount of the AAP payment is based on the child's needs and the prospective family's circumstances, with eligibility reassessed every two years. Pursuant to Assembly Bill 390 (Chapter 547, Statutes of 2000), the statewide median income guideline shall not be used for negotiations between the prospective adoptive family and the adoption agency to determine the amount of payment to be received.

The AAP benefit shall not exceed the age-related, foster family home care rate for which the child would otherwise be eligible. The AAP payment may include the value of a specialized care increment that would have been paid on behalf of a child due to health and/or behavioral problems. Payments may continue until the child attains the age of 18, unless a mental or physical handicap warrants the continuation of assistance until the child reaches the age of 21.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16115 through 16123.
- Cases presumed to be eligible for the federal AAP make up 84.0 percent of the total AAP payment caseload, based on data through December 2010 as reported on the CA 800 claim forms.
- Caseload and expenditure data extracted from the CA 800 provide the basis for caseload and average grant projections.
- The federal and nonfederal average grants are \$823.97 and \$800.88, respectively, for Fiscal Year 2010-11 and \$841.08 and \$803.45, respectively, for FY 2011-12, based on a 24-month linear trend analysis.
- The impact of the *California Foster Parent Association, et al vs. John A. Wagner* court decision that increases the Foster Family Home (FFH) basic rate will be displayed in the FFH Rate Increase – FFH Impact premise.
- The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

METHODOLOGY:

AAP basic costs are the product of projected federal and nonfederal case months and the respective average grant, as identified above.

Adoption Assistance Program – Basic Costs

FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act for those cases meeting eligibility criteria, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP rate. Federal case costs ineligible for FFP and the costs of the nonfederal program are shared 75 percent General Fund and 25 percent county.

The Title IV-E FMAP rate temporarily increased by 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. This increase was approved by the federal government to extend until June 30, 2011. This extension of the ARRA results in an increase of 3.2 percent for the third quarter of FY 2010-11 and an increase of 1.2 percent for the fourth quarter of FY 2010-11. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The Current Year and Budget Year decrease reflects a decrease in the average monthly caseload.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase reflects an increase in the projected average monthly caseload and the average grants.

CASELOAD:

	2010-11	2011-12
Average Monthly Caseload	84,197	86,393

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$828,563	\$865,711
Federal	342,285	358,725
State	364,709	380,240
County	121,569	126,746
Reimbursements	0	0

Adoption Assistance Program – De-Link (P.L. 110-351)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings associated with shifting qualified non-federal Adoption Assistance Program (AAP) cases to Title IV-E eligible cases by de-linking the income requirements of the Aid for Dependent Children – Foster Care (FC) and Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment programs. This premise is a result of the federal Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 Public Law (P.L.)

110-351, which was an omnibus child welfare bill designed to ensure greater permanence and improve the well-being of children served by public child welfare agencies.

Assembly Bill (AB) 154 (Chapter 222, Statutes of 2009), which conforms to P.L. 110-351, requires any savings from recent changes in eligibility for federal funding to support adoption assistance payments to be spent for the provision of foster care and adoption services.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 2009.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: P.L. 110-351; Section 16120 of the Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC).
- W&IC sections 16118 and 16132 contain the requirement of the re-investment of savings as stated in AB 154.
- Caseload data based on FC exits to AAP from January 2010 through December 2010.
- The Current Year (CY) caseload equals an average monthly caseload of 172 qualified, non-federal cases. This includes cases that were in FC for more than five years, or are ages 14 and older, and the siblings of these cases that were placed in the same adoption placement.
- The Budget Year (BY) caseload equals an average monthly caseload of 325 qualified, non-federal cases. This includes cases that were in FC for more than five years, or are ages 12 and older, and the siblings of these cases that were placed in the same adoption placement.
- The non-federal average grants are \$800.88 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11, and \$803.45 for FY 2011-12, based on a 24-month linear trend analysis.
- The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.
- General Fund (GF) savings associated with this premise will be used to offset the costs of the Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project premise. For additional information, see the Residentially Based Services (AB 1453) premise.

METHODOLOGY:

The costs for the qualified, non-federal cases are calculated by multiplying the casemonths by the non-federal, AAP sharing ratios. The costs for these cases are then calculated using federal, Title IV-E eligible, and AAP sharing ratios. The difference between these costs results in a savings to GF and county expenditures, with a corresponding increase in federal costs.

Adoption Assistance Program – De-Link (P.L. 110-351)

FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act for those cases meeting eligibility criteria, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP rate. Federal case costs ineligible for FFP and the costs of the nonfederal program are shared 75 percent GF and 25 percent county.

The Title IV-E FMAP rate temporarily increased by 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. This increase was approved by the federal government to extend until June 30, 2011. This extension of the ARRA results in an increase of 3.2 percent for the third quarter of FY 2010-11 and an increase of 1.2 percent for the fourth quarter of

FY 2010-11. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The CY and BY changes reflects a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the average non-federal grant.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This increase reflects a projected caseload increase, due to allowing the 12 years and older age group, and their siblings, to qualify for this premise.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total Savings	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	829	1,565
State	-622	-1,174
County	-207	-391
Reimbursements	0	0

	2010-11	2011-12
Savings Funding RBS	Grant	Grant
Total	-\$48	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	-19	0
County	-29	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Adoption Assistance Program – De-Link (P.L. 110-351)

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Remaining AAP	Grant	Grant
De-Link Savings		
Total	\$48	\$0
Federal	829	1,565
State	-603	-1,174
County	-178	-391
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

AAP Reform – No Increase Based on Age

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings associated with not increasing the grant amount for a child who enters the Adoption Assistance Program (AAP) on or after January 1, 2010, because of aging up into the next age category.

Children eligible for AAP benefits have one of the following characteristics that are barriers to adoption: mental, physical, medical or emotional handicap; ethnic background, race, color, or language; over three years of age; member of a sibling group to be adopted by one family; or adverse parental background (e.g., drug addiction, mental illness). To be eligible to receive federal benefits, the child shall have been otherwise eligible to receive aid under the federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care program. The amount of the AAP payment is based on the child's needs and the prospective family's circumstances, with eligibility reassessed every two years. Any increases to the grant due to the reassessment will be based on special circumstances tied to the child's needs.

The AAP benefit shall not exceed the age-related, foster family home care rate for which the child would otherwise be eligible. The AAP payment may include the value of a specialized care increment that would have been paid on behalf of a child due to health and/or behavioral problems. Payments may continue until the child attains the age of 18, unless a mental or physical handicap warrants the continuation of assistance until the child reaches the age of 21.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2010.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16121.
- Cases presumed to be eligible for the federal AAP make up 84.0 percent of the total AAP payment caseload, based on data through June 2010, as reported on the CA 800 claim forms.
- Based on Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 entries into AAP, 1,529 cases annually would receive a grant increase due to an increase in age.
- Based on the foster family home care rate schedule, the increases in the grant amount due to age are as follows: 0-4 years of age to 5-8, \$39; 5-8 years of age to 9-11, \$34; 9-11 years of age to 12-14, \$55; 12-14 years of age to 15-19, \$54.
- The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.
- This premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

AAP Reform – No Increase Based on Age

METHODOLOGY:

The number of cases in each age category that will age up into the next age category are multiplied by the corresponding grant increase. The result is the overall savings due to not granting this increase based on an increase in age.

FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act for those cases meeting eligibility criteria, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP rate. Federal case costs ineligible for FFP and the costs of the nonfederal program are shared 75 percent General Fund (GF) and 25 percent county.

The Title IV-E FMAP rate temporarily increased by 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. This increase was approved by the federal government to extend until June 30, 2011. This extension of the ARRA results in an increase of 3.2 percent for the third quarter of FY 2010-11 and an increase of 1.2 percent for the fourth quarter of FY 2010-11. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise. For more information, please see the ARRA premise description.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The Current Year and Budget year increase in GF savings is due to an increase in the non-federal caseload.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase savings is due to the accumulation of cases from the CY through the BY.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	-\$793	-\$1,558
Federal	-333	-654
State	-345	-678
County	-115	-226
Reimbursements	0	0

Foster Care and AAP Overpayments

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with Title IV-E Foster Care (FC) and Adoption Assistance Payment (AAP) Overpayments. The federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Region IX has notified the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) that the federal share of Title IV-E overpayments identified through state audits performed on group homes and the share of Title IV-E overpayments identified through county overpayments must be returned immediately once the overpayment has been identified as required by federal regulations. The practice has been to repay the federal share upon recoupment from foster care providers. Therefore, DHHS has issued a demand for repayment for the federal share of all state and county overpayments identified regardless of whether or not CDSS collects the overpayment.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

Adjustments to federal claim began in Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- This estimate reflects costs for the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver FC counties, and the 58 county AAP program from July 1, 2007.
- Beginning July 1, 2009, counties will begin paying their share of the reported overpayments.

METHODOLOGY:

Overpayments are estimated based on actual county claims.

FUNDING:

Senate Bill 84 (Chapter 177, Statutes of 2007) requires that General Fund (GF) will pay the full federal share of all uncollected overpayments until regulations have been adopted, after which counties will be required to share at the normal non-federal foster care sharing ratios. Funding for the repayment of the federal Title IV-E overpayments will be 40 percent GF and 60 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

FC - The Current Year (CY) decrease in costs is based on actual FC claims. The Budget Year (BY) decrease reflects a decline in FC caseload

AAP – The CY increase in cost is based on actual AAP claims. The BY increase reflects an increase in AAP caseload.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

FC - This decrease is the result of a projected decline in the overall FC caseload.

AAP- This increase is the result of a projected increase in the overall AAP caseload.

Foster Care and AAP Overpayments

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

ITEM 101 – FC Payments	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$868	\$775
Federal	0	0
State	347	310
County	521	465
Reimbursements	0	0
ITEM 101 – AAP Payments	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$588	\$604
Federal	0	0
State	441	453
County	147	151
Reimbursements	0	0

Foster Care & NACF Administrative Costs – Basic

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the administrative and staff development costs for the Foster Care (FC) and Non-Assistance CalFresh (NACF) programs. Historically, the budget for county administration was based on counties administrative budget requests made through a Proposed County Administrative Budget (PCAB) process, modified by a cost containment system consistent with Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 14154. Beginning with Fiscal Year (FY) 2001-02 the PCAB process was suspended and the last PCAB process, FY 2000-01, established the base from which future year costs are established. Adjustments for caseload changes and other factors are made during each subvention process.

The FC administrative costs include the county administration for the Adoption Assistance Program (AAP). County eligibility workers are required to perform administrative functions related to AAP. Specifically, verification of linkage to the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program (formerly Aid to Families with Dependent Children program) is required for all new AAP cases to establish federal or nonfederal eligibility. Linkage is based on the child's situation at the time of removal from the natural home. The child must meet the general eligibility requirements for TANF and qualify as either a federal or state-only foster care case. Recertification is also required on an annual basis.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise is an annual appropriation.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC section 14154.
- The FC estimate for the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties in FY 2010-11 is being held at the 2010-11 Appropriation level. Base funding for FC Administrative Costs Basic for FY 2011-12 is \$36.5 million.
- The non-Title IV-E Waiver FC caseload is projected to decline 9.8 percent for FY 2010-11 and for an additional decline of 10.2 percent in FY 2011-12.
- The Staff Development costs for FC are \$553,931 for FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12, based on the last four quarters of actual expenditures.
- The AAP costs of \$17.5 million for FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 are based on the last four quarters of actual expenditures.
- Contract costs for FC are \$143,000 for FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12.
- The NACF Administrative costs in FY 2010-11 are held to the Appropriation.
- The NACF Administrative costs base funding is \$1,080.5 million in FY 2011-12.
- The NACF caseload growth projection is 18.4 percent in FY 2011-12.
- Staff development costs for NACF are \$11.8 million for FY 2011-12, based on Calendar Year 2010 actual expenditures.

Foster Care & NACF Administrative Costs – Basic

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) Development and Testing Interface costs for NACF are \$230,113 for FY 2011-12.
- Contract costs for NACF are \$3.3 million for FY 2011-12.
- The Merced Automated Global Information Control (MAGIC) system administrative costs for NACF and FC are \$97,206 and \$7,776, respectively for both FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12.
- Savings from Legacy System data collection and quality control systems for NACF are \$3.9 million for FY 2011-12. Savings from Legacy System data collection and quality control systems for FC are \$505,000 for FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12.

METHODOLOGY:

The NACF and FC non-Title IV-E Waiver counties basic funding are adjusted to reflect caseload growth and updated premises. Staff development expenditures, the MAGIC system, and contract costs were added to both the NACF and FC estimates. AAP administrative expenditures were also added to the FC estimate.

FUNDING:

FC and NACF costs are shared 50 percent federal, 35 percent General Fund (GF), and 15 percent county.

Note: W&IC section 15204.4 requires Maintenance of Effort (MOE) from the counties based on expenditures during FY 1996-97, which include the administration of food stamps. Please reference the "County MOE Adjustment" premise. However, W&IC section 18906.55 provides that in FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12, counties shall receive the full GF allocation without the requirement to pay county's share above MOE if a county meets MOE requirements entirely through CalFresh Administrative expenditures. Please reference the "County MOE Requirement" premise.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

For FC, the Current Year (CY) was held to Appropriation. The Budget Year (BY) increase is a result of a projected decrease in the FC caseload offset by an increase in AAP actual expenditures. For CalFresh, the CY was held to the Appropriation. The BY increase is a result of projected caseload growth.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

For FC, decrease is based on actual expenditures and reflects a projected caseload decline.

For NACF the increase is associated with projected NACF caseload growth.

Foster Care & NACF Administrative Costs – Basic

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

Foster Care	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$58,971	\$53,147
Federal	32,864	29,772
State	20,748	19,049
County	5,359	4,326
Reimbursements	0	0

NACF	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,098,057	\$1,290,781
Federal	551,074	645,322
State	414,545	465,448
County	132,438	180,011
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Foster Care Reforms

DESCRIPTION:

The California Department of Social Services implemented the annual redetermination of eligibility for foster care grants, resulting in the Current Year (CY) savings of \$5.3 million and the Budget Year (BY) savings of \$4.4 million.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2004.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.

METHODOLOGY:

The estimate assumes a 20 percent reduction in continuing caseload eligibility costs as a result of reducing the redetermination requirement from every 6 months to every 12 months.

FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act for cases meeting eligibility criteria, with the level of FFP based on the FMAP rate. Funding for the nonfederal share of federal program costs and for cases not meeting federal eligibility criteria is 40 percent General Fund and 60 percent county funds.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The CY was held to Appropriation. The BY decrease in savings is based on actual expenditures.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decreased savings are the result of lower FC caseloads and expenditures.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2010-11	2011-12
Total	-\$5,276	-\$4,356
Federal	-3,011	-2,522
State	-1,593	-1,290
County	-672	-544
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Restructuring the Foster Care Group Home Rate System

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects funding for a Group Home rates expert county consultant and intergovernmental transfers (recently retired county child welfare managers) to work along with California Department of Social Services (CDSS) staff. This funding is to be used to conduct an evaluation of the new rate methodology developed as a result of this project.

The CDSS, county placements agencies, advocates, and foster children themselves have long been dissatisfied with the outcomes for foster children placed in congregate group home care. A recent court order in the California Alliance of Child and Family Services (Alliance) lawsuit raised the Group Home rates paid to group homes in California by 32 percent. The court order requires that the current rate system, the Rate Classification Level (RCL) system be adjusted annually hereafter, according to the California Necessities Index.

The RCL system was developed over 20 years ago. It has no direct connection to quality of care or the measurement of improved outcomes for children in care. Changing the rates system to be more responsive to these factors will be supportive of the state's current Children and Family Services Review Program Improvement Plan as well as the interests of advocates, children, placement agencies, and the state.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2011.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: A recent court order in the California Alliance of Child and Family Services (Alliance) lawsuit.
- Assumes costs will fund a Group Home rates expert and a county consultant.
- CDSS expects to complete the rate study in Fiscal Year (FY) 2012-13.

METHODOLOGY:

In the Budget Year (BY), \$250,000 will fund a Group Home rates expert and a county consultant.

FUNDING:

This premise is shared 50 percent GF and 50 percent federal Title IV-E funding, with no county share.

Restructuring the Foster Care Group Home Rate System

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

For Current Year the funding was eliminated, there is no change in BY.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This is a BY item.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$0	\$250
Federal	0	125
State	0	125
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Emergency Assistance Program

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the Emergency Assistance (EA) Foster Care (FC) programs, which provide funding for benefits and services granted to children and families in emergency situations. Eligibility is restricted to one episode in any 12-month period. The EA-FC Welfare program provides support payments for dependents and voluntary FC placements not otherwise eligible for federal Title IV-E benefits. The "Child Welfare Services-Emergency Assistance" premise discusses additional program components.

Public Law (P.L.) 104-193 eliminated Title IV-A funding for the EA program but permitted use of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) dollars for EA funding. Although P.L. 104-193 allowed TANF funding for this portion of the EA program, the Budget Act of 1997 replaced the TANF funding with General Fund (GF). Based on interpretation of the final TANF regulations, that EA GF expenditures are not countable towards the TANF maintenance of effort requirement, effective October 1, 1999, the GF was replaced with TANF funding.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The EA-FC Welfare program became effective September 1, 1993.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10101.
- Based on actual expenditure and caseload data through December 2010, the projected average grant for EA-FC cases is \$1,444.61
- EA case months are projected using a five-month linear trend forecast based on actual caseload data.
- The Current Year (CY) EA administrative costs have been updated based on actual claims.
- Foster children receiving EA benefits are eligible to receive the \$100 supplemental clothing allowance.

METHODOLOGY:

- **Item 101** – EA-FC costs are the product of projected case months and the computed average grant, plus the cost of the supplemental clothing allowance for each case.
- **Item 141** – Costs for administrative activities performed by County Welfare Department staff are based upon actual expenditures and adjusted for caseload growth in Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and FY 2011-12. Administrative costs also include \$35,000 added to the federal share for reimbursements to the California Department of Health Services for data processing activities associated with the Assistance to Children in Emergency System, which enables tracking of EA cases currently receiving assistance.

FUNDING:

EA funding was used in the TANF block grant calculation and, therefore, is part of the TANF funding schedule.

Effective October 1, 1999, the EA-FC component is funded 70 percent TANF, 30 percent county, and the EA administrative costs are funded 85 percent TANF and 15 percent county.

The supplemental clothing allowance component is funded 100 percent with TANF.

Emergency Assistance Program

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The CY and Budget Year (BY) Item 101 increase is the result of higher caseload than was projected in the November 2010 Subvention.

The CY administrative cost was held to Appropriation. The BY administrative costs increase is based on actual expenditures.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The Item 101 change reflects a projected increase in caseload.
The administrative costs are updated based on actual expenditures.

CASELOAD:

	2010-11	2011-12
Average Monthly Caseload	3,770	3,815

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

ITEMS 101 & 141 – EA

	2010-11		2011-12	
	Grant	County Admin.	Grant	County Admin.
Total	\$65,730	\$6,328	\$66,512	\$6,402
Federal	0	0	0	0
State	46,124	5,384	46,673	5,447
County	19,606	944	19,839	955
Reimbursements	0	0	0	0

Court Cases

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects settlement costs and attorney fees relating to the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Foster Care (FC), CalFresh, and Adoption Assistance Program (AAP). The costs result from the settlement of lawsuits related to local assistance in accordance with Budget Letter 98-22, and instructions from the Department of Finance.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Item 101 – TANF Administration

- A total of \$605,177 is budgeted in Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 for attorney fees and settlement costs associated with small court cases expected to be resolved in the Current Year (CY).
- A total of \$645,000 is budgeted in FY 2011-12 for attorney fees and settlement costs associated with small court cases expected to be resolved in the Budget Year (BY).

Item 141 – FC, AAP, and CalFresh Administration

- A total of \$5,630,000 is budgeted in FY 2010-11 for attorney fees and settlement costs associated with small court cases expected to be resolved in the Current Year (CY).
- A total of \$3,106,000 is budgeted in FY 2011-12 for attorney fees and settlement costs associated with small court cases expected to be resolved in the Budget Year (BY).

METHODOLOGY:

Item 101 – TANF Administration

The estimate is based on actual and projected attorney fees, settlement costs, and miscellaneous writs to be paid in FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12.

Item 141 – FC, AAP, and CalFresh Administration

The estimate is based on actual and projected attorney fees, settlement costs, and miscellaneous writs to be paid in FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12.

FUNDING:

Item 101 –TANF Administration

The funding is 100 percent TANF.

Item 141 – FC, AAP, and CalFresh Administration

Attorney fees associated with federally-eligible cases are shared 50 percent federal and 50 percent General Fund (GF). Attorney fees associated with nonfederally-eligible cases are funded 100 percent GF. Court settlement costs are shared at the same ratios as the respective programs (i.e. AAP and Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care [AFDC-FC]).

Court Cases

CHANGE FROM THE MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The change in the CY TANF administration is a result of decreased court case costs. The increase in the BY is a result of increased court case costs.

The change in FC, AAP, and CalFresh is due to decreased costs of cases that are expected to settle.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in the BY TANF administration court case costs is due to increased costs associated with a court case from FC to TANF.

The decrease in the BY FC, AAP, and CalFresh court costs is due to decreased costs of cases that are expected to settle in the BY.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

ITEM 101 –	2010-11	2011-12
TANF Administration		
Total	\$605	\$645
Federal	605	645
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0
 ITEM 141 –	 2010-11	 2011-12
FC, AAP and CalFresh Administration		
Total	\$5,630	\$3,106
Federal	2,815	1,553
State	2,815	1,553
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Child Welfare Services – Basic Costs

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs incurred by County Welfare Departments (CWDs) in the administration of each component of the Child Welfare Services (CWS) program as established through the Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 16500. W&IC section 11461(e)(4)(B) provides additional funding to counties as incentives and assistance specifically for the Aid to Families with Dependent Children/Foster Care Specialized Care Program. These funds will be used to cover the purchase of nonrecurring items on an as needed basis, the purchase of services not available through other fund sources, the development of a respite care program, or purchase of respite care services.

In recognition of the funding and staffing needs identified by the workload study authorized by Senate Bill (SB) 2030 (Chapter 785, Statutes of 1998), the estimate reflects funding to allow counties to maintain the level of social workers funded in the prior year.

Emergency Response (ER) Component

ER services consist of a response system providing in-person response, when required, to reports of child abuse, neglect, or exploitation for the purpose of investigation and to determine the necessity for providing initial intake services and crisis intervention to maintain the child safely in his or her own home or to protect the safety of the child.

Emergency Response Assessment (ERA) Component

ERA is the initial intake service provided in response to reported allegations of child abuse, neglect or exploitation that is determined, based upon an evaluation of risk, to be inappropriate for an in-person investigation.

Family Maintenance (FM) Component

FM is designed to provide time-limited protective services to prevent or remedy neglect, abuse or exploitation for the purpose of preventing separation of children from their families. CWDs are responsible for determining the specific service needs of the child and family aimed at sustaining the child in the home.

Family Reunification (FR) Component

FR is designed to provide time-limited services while the child is in temporary foster care to prevent or remedy neglect, abuse or exploitation when the child cannot safely remain at home. CWDs are responsible for determining the specific service needs of the child and/or family aimed at reunifying the child with the family.

Permanent Placement (PP) Component

PP is designed to provide an alternative permanent family structure for children who because of abuse, neglect, or exploitation cannot safely remain at home and who are unlikely to ever return home. The CWDs are responsible for determining the appropriate permanent goal for the child and facilitating the implementation of that goal. These goals are defined as guardianship, adoption or long-term placement.

Child Welfare Services – Basic Costs

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC sections 16500 and 11461(e)(4)(B).
- The Title IV-E portion of this estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties, excluding training.
- The workload standard was adopted by the California Department of Social Services in conjunction with the County Welfare Directors' Association in 1984. These standards are 15.8 for ER, 35.0 for FM, 27.0 for FR, 54.0 for PP and 320.0 for ERA.
- The statewide annual cost of a social worker (SW) (\$129,074) was based on the estimated cost of providing services, to include total staff costs, support costs, and electronic data processing costs, provided in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2001-02 proposed county administrative budgets.
- All counties are reporting caseload data on the CWS/Case Management System (CMS). Caseload projections were developed for each individual county using data through October 2010.
- Additional funds are provided in recognition of the funding and staffing need identified by the workload study authorized by SB 2030. Costs are calculated in order to continue each county's SW full-time equivalent (FTE) level funded in the prior year.

METHODOLOGY:

FY 2010-11

- The Current Year (CY) estimate is being held to the Budget Act of 2010 Appropriation.

FY 2011-12

- The Budget Year (BY) estimate is derived by applying the workload standards to the individual county caseload projections and expanding for a 7:1 supervisory ratio. Additional FTEs are included in order to continue each county's prior year FTE level.
- The annual cost of a SW in each county is applied to the total number of FTEs in each county to derive staff costs for each line.
- Direct costs are projected from FY 2009-10 actual expenditures and statewide average caseload growth from FY 2008-09 to FY 2009-10. Total direct costs, excluding county-operated emergency shelter care (ESC), are \$85.2 million for the 56 counties. The projected county-operated ESC costs are \$43.1 million for those counties with county-operated emergency shelters based on actual expenditures from FY 2009-10.

Child Welfare Services – Basic Costs

METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

- Once the total CWS basic costs are derived, costs for the Emergency Assistance (EA) Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program are subtracted and are displayed separately under the EA TANF premise. The EA program costs are determined based on the FY 2010-11 funding level and any caseload growth.
- Case Management costs previously funded under the EA program were shifted to CWS Basic.
- In order to reflect an appropriate level of federal spending authority, additional Title IV-E and Title XIX funds are added to the estimate.
- An additional \$2.1 million General Fund (GF) is shifted to this premise from CWS/CMS System Support Staff to comply with federal Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System requirements and is matched with federal Title IV-E funds.

FUNDING:

FY 2011-12

The federal share of costs is a combination of Titles IV-B, IV-E, XIX and XX funds. The Title IV-B funds are limited by the capped federal allocation.

The estimated Title IV-B funds available in local assistance are \$32.9 million.

The Title IV-E amount reflects the actual expenditures from FY 2009-10 that 35.8 percent of the expenditures will be eligible for Title IV-E funding. In order to reflect an appropriate level of federal spending authority based on actual expenditures, additional Title IV-E funds are budgeted in the amount of \$55.2 million.

The Title XIX amount is calculated using individual county usage rates based on FY 2009-10 expenditure data which reflect that 7.9 percent of the expenditures will be eligible for Title XIX funding. These costs are reflected as a reimbursement. In order to reflect an appropriate level of federal spending authority based on actual expenditures, additional Title XIX funds are budgeted in the amount of \$484 million.

Nonfederal costs are shared at 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

After the GF amount is calculated, federal Title XX funds transferred from the TANF block grant are used in lieu of GF. The amount of Title XX eligible costs is calculated based on the nonmatching GF portion of FR and PP expenditures. For FY 2011-12, the Title XX eligible amount is \$39.2 million.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the CY. Costs in the BY have been increased based on updated actual expenditures.

Child Welfare Services – Basic Costs

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease is due mainly to decreases in direct costs and ESC costs. Also, additional federal spending authority has been decreased based on updated actual expenditures.

CASELOAD:

(Average Monthly for non-Title IV-E counties)

	2010-11	2011-12
Emergency Response	27,139	26,205
Emergency Response Assessment	12,494	12,980
Family Maintenance	12,946	11,266
Family Reunification	13,356	13,109
Permanent Placement	24,521	22,741

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total Basic	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$845,923	\$824,694
Federal	327,831	312,223
State	282,583	278,506
County	111,837	109,344
Reimbursements	123,672	124,621

Child Welfare Services – Basic Costs

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

Reconciliation of Federal Funds:

	2010-11	2011-12
Title IV-B	\$32,523	\$32,880
Title IV-E	258,491	245,711
Title XIX	123,672	124,621
Title XX	<u>36,817</u>	<u>33,632</u>
Total Federal Funding	\$451,503	\$436,844

Specialized Care:

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$3,865	\$3,531
Federal	0	0
State	3,865	3,531
County	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Federal Budget Bill – Loss of Federal Financial Participation (FFP)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to backfill the loss of federal Title IV-E funds for children placed in hospitals or mental health institutions for longer than 30 days. Public Law (P.L.) 109-171 was signed February 8, 2006 (but effective October 1, 2005) and limits the claiming of Title IV-E administrative costs when a child is placed in an ineligible facility to the 30 days prior to the child being moved to a Title IV-E eligible facility or home. Prior to P.L. 109-171, there was no limit on administrative claiming if the county was providing pre-placement preventive services or preparing for the child to enter foster care.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

P.L. 109-171 effective date was October 1, 2005.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- P.L. 109-171 was signed February 8, 2006.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- There are approximately 164 cases placed in non-foster care facilities over 30 days.
- The children placed in ineligible foster care facilities represent 0.12 percent of the total foster care caseload.

METHODOLOGY:

The costs are calculated by multiplying the Title IV-E funded Child Welfare Services (CWS) Basic budgeted expenditures by the percent of cases that are placed in ineligible facilities.

FUNDING:

These costs are ineligible for Title IV-E and are funded 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county funds.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to an increase in Title IV-E CWS Basic budgeted expenditures.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The Title IV-E funded CWS Basic budgeted expenditures have decreased.

Federal Budget Bill – Loss of Federal Financial Participation (FFP)

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	-227	-224
State	159	157
County	68	67
Reimbursements	0	0

Augmentation to Child Welfare Services

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide an augmentation to the Child Welfare Services (CWS) program. These funds shall be expressly targeted for services provided through the Emergency Response, Family Maintenance, Family Reunification (FR), and Permanent Placement (PP) components of CWS, and shall not be used to supplant existing CWS funds. Funds will be available to counties contingent upon individual counties: 1) matching their CWS Basic General Fund (GF) allocation; and, 2) fully utilizing the CWS/Case Management System. There is no county match required for these funds.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise, formerly known as "Emergency Workload Relief," was implemented on July 1, 1998.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Assembly Bill (AB) 1656 (Chapter 324, Statutes of 1998) and AB 1740 (Chapter 52, Statutes of 2000).
- AB 1656 authorized \$40 million in GF with no county match required.
- AB 1740 authorized an additional \$34.3 million in GF with no county match required.
- The GF Appropriation has been reduced by \$17.2 million due to lower revenues and other demands on the available GF.
- The 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties' portion of the total augmentation is \$36.7 million GF.

METHODOLOGY:

AB 1656 and AB 1740 designated the GF amount; however, due to lower revenues and other demands on the available GF, the GF Appropriation has been reduced by \$17.2 million.

FUNDING:

- After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent GF.
- After the GF amount is calculated, federal Title XX funds transferred from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant are used in lieu of GF. The amount of Title XX-eligible costs is calculated based on the nonmatching GF portion of FR and PP expenditures. For FY 2010-11, the Title XX-eligible amount is \$5.4 million. For FY 2011-12, the Title XX-eligible amount is also \$5.4 million.

Augmentation to Child Welfare Services

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate and a decrease in Title XX-eligible costs.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

Augmentation Funds:

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$56,501	\$55,646
Federal	25,179	24,315
State	31,322	31,331
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Child Welfare Services/Case Management System – System Support Staff

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost for county administrative staff needed to support the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System which was implemented as a result of Senate Bill 370 (Chapter 1294, Statutes of 1989). The staff are needed for the ongoing operations of the system.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

There was a staggered implementation based on individual county start dates beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 1996-97.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16501.5.
- The base amount is \$25,119,682, consistent with the FY 2005-06 Appropriation.
- Of the base amount, funds budgeted for this premise are based on actual expenditures. The remaining General Fund is budgeted as part of Child Welfare Services (CWS) Basic.

METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is based on actual expenditures.

FUNDING:

Costs are shared according to California's federally approved Cost Allocation Plan, which allocates costs to all benefiting CWS programs based on statewide county worker time study hours.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to an increase in actual expenditures.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to an increase in actual expenditures.

Child Welfare Services/Case Management System – System Support Staff

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$18,035	\$18,109
Federal	8,899	8,929
State	5,502	5,506
County	2,694	2,704
Reimbursements	940	970

Child Welfare Services – Emergency Assistance Program (TANF)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the Child Welfare Services (CWS) Emergency Assistance (EA) program funded through federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and General Fund (GF).

In 1993, the California Department of Social Services implemented a statewide EA program under Title IV-A of the Social Security Act for county welfare departments that provide funding for emergency shelter care to children determined to be at risk due to abuse, neglect, abandonment, or exploitation.

In 1994, CDSS implemented crisis resolution and emergency response (ER) as the child welfare services components of EA. Crisis resolution provides services to families aimed at resolving family crises without removing the child from the home or by allowing the child to be returned to the family with the provision of supporting services to ensure child safety. Under EA/ER, funds are available for emergency response activities such as receiving and assessing referrals, investigating emergency allegations, and gathering and evaluating relevant information.

Public Law (P.L.) 104-193 eliminated Title IV-A funding for the EA program but permitted use of TANF dollars for EA funding. Although P.L. 104-193 allowed TANF funding, the Budget Act of 1997 replaced the TANF funding with GF. Based on an interpretation of the final TANF regulations, effective October 1, 1999, EA GF expenditures are not countable towards the TANF maintenance of effort requirement. Therefore, the GF was replaced with TANF funding. In 2001, EA case management activities were funded with Title IV-E funds in order to free-up TANF dollars. In 2008, clarifying instructions were given by the federal Administration for Children and Families that EA case management costs are not Title IV-E eligible, and therefore are shifted to GF. Beginning FY 2010-11, EA Case Management is being eliminated and associated costs are being shifted into CWS Basic.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

Emergency Shelter Care - This component implemented on September 1, 1993.

Crisis Resolution - This component implemented on August 1, 1994.

Emergency Response - This component implemented on August 1, 1994.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 15204.25.
- There is no caseload growth projected for Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12.
- The estimate reflects costs for all 58 counties.

METHODOLOGY:

The total costs are based on the prior year and increased by any individual county caseload growth. The appropriate sharing ratios are then applied to the total costs.

Child Welfare Services – Emergency Assistance Program (TANF)

FUNDING:

EA TANF funding, although eliminated by P.L. 104-193, was used in the TANF block grant calculation and is, therefore, part of the TANF funding schedule.

The sharing ratio for EA eligible shelter care cases under 30 days, emergency response, and crisis resolution is 85 percent TANF and 15 percent county. For shelter care EA eligible cases over 30 days, the ratio is 50 percent TANF and 50 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$209,563	\$209,563
Federal	173,500	173,500
State	0	0
County	36,063	36,063
Reimbursements	0	0

Gomez v. Saenz

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for county activities related to the *Gomez, et al. v. Saenz* court settlement. Specifically, costs are for counties to enact a notification and grievance process to provide due process to any persons desiring to challenge their listing on the Child Abuse Central Index, both prospectively and retroactively.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The premise implemented in Fiscal Year 2007-08.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Senate Bill 84, (Chapter 177, Statutes of 2007).
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- On April 06, 2009 the federal Administration for Children and Families declared that costs associated with this premise are not eligible for Title IV-E funding.

METHODOLOGY:

Costs are projected based on actual expenditures from the prior Calendar Year.

FUNDING:

Costs are not eligible for federal Title IV-E funding. Costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in actual expenditures.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to an increase in actual expenditures.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,280	\$1,848
Federal	0	0
State	896	1,294
County	384	554
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

State Family Preservation

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the authorization for the permanent transfer of funds from an incentive/penalty provision program to a program with a sharing ratio of 70 percent General Fund (GF) and 30 percent county. In accordance with Assembly Bill 2365 (Chapter 71, Statutes of 1992), the counties that have operated a family preservation program for at least three years can participate in the program. Historically, funding was provided through an annual allocation derived from a shift in funds from the GF (and federal share, to the extent permitted under federal law) of the Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care appropriation. Fifteen counties opted to participate in the program which included an incentive/penalty provision based on increases/decreases in foster care placements. However, the foster care caseloads began to stabilize which resulted in little savings. Therefore, counties were given the option to permanently transfer funding to a 70 percent GF and 30 percent county share limited to not exceed 70 percent of the highest annual amount spent for family preservation.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 1993-94.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16500.5 through 16500.7.
- Alameda County's funding is reflected under Item 153 Title IV-E Waiver, while Los Angeles County's funding is reflected under this premise.
- The GF share of \$21,493,000 reflects up to 70 percent of the highest annual amount expended for family preservation services by 14 counties (Contra Costa, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Mendocino, Napa, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, and Stanislaus.)
- This premise provides the 25 percent match for Promoting Safe and Stable Families.
- For FY 2010-11, \$415,000 GF will be used as match for the additional funds necessary under the Increased Funding for Caseworker Visits as a result of the State's failure to meet its FY 2010 target of 75 percent of children in foster care being visited by their caseworkers each month they were in foster care. As a result of the federal penalty, the federal financial participation rate was reduced from 75 percent to 74 percent, which requires additional GF participation of one percent.
- For FY 2010-11, \$277,778 GF will be used as the GF match under the Federal Grant to Reduce Long-Term Foster Care premise in order to secure \$2.5 million in federal funds.
- For FY 2011-12, \$333,333 GF will be used as the GF match under the Federal Grant to Reduce Long-Term Foster Care premise in order to secure \$3 million in federal funds.

State Family Preservation

METHODOLOGY:

The estimate reflects the amount of funds that counties permanently transferred.

FUNDING:

The federal Title IV-E, nonfederal, and federal Title XIX reimbursement funding levels are based on FY 2001-02 expenditure data.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$34,645	\$34,645
Federal	3,540	3,540
State	21,493	21,493
County	8,916	8,916
Reimbursements	696	696

Extended Independent Living Program

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the General Fund (GF) portion of the Independent Living Program (ILP), which provides training for eligible foster care adolescents aged 16 to 21 years old, enabling them to be independent when their foster care terminates. Senate Bill (SB) 933 (Chapter 311, Statutes of 1998) implemented the GF portion to extend ILP services to 100 percent of the eligible foster care adolescent population, up to the age of 21 years. County Welfare Departments (CWD) provide or arrange for the provision of services that facilitate the transition of foster children to emancipated lifestyles.

In addition, counties are given the discretion to provide ILP services to youth ages 14 and 15, when it is determined that these youth would most likely remain in foster care until emancipated. Counties are authorized to use up to 30 percent of their allocation to provide housing assistance for emancipated foster youth and aftercare service to former foster youth ages 18 to 21.

Effective January 1, 2006, SB 436 (Chapter 629, Statutes of 2005) requires the CWD in a county that provides transitional housing placement services to include in its annual ILP report a description of currently available transitional housing resources in relation to the number of emancipating pregnant or parenting foster youth in the county, and a plan for meeting any unmet transitional housing needs of the emancipating pregnant or parenting foster youth.

SB 654 (Chapter 555, Statutes of 2010) allows youth who enter into a non-related legal guardianship ordered between the ages of eight through 15 to also receive ILP services. These youth will be provided with state only funding at age 16 and 17 and will be eligible for federally funded ILP services at ages 18-21.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented in September 1998.

SB 436 (Chapter 629, Statutes of 2005) implemented on January 1, 2006.

SB 654 (Chapter 555, Statutes of 2010) implemented on January 1, 2011.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10609.3 and SB 436 (Chapter 629, Statutes of 2005).
- SB 654 adds Section 10609.45 to the Welfare and Institutions Code specifying that a child placed with a nonrelated legal guardian, whose guardianship was ordered on or after the child's eighth birthday, shall be provided services if their dependency was dismissed on or after their 16th birthday under the ILP. These youth will be provided with state only funding at age 16 and 17 and will be eligible for federally funded ILP services at ages 18-21.
- Effective January 2006, additional GF was allocated to support SB 436 activities.
 - At least one hour per case to collect and report available transitional housing resources, and develop a plan for meeting any unmet transitional housing needs of the emancipating pregnant or parenting foster youth.
 - The social worker cost per hour is \$72.60.
 - For Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, there was a total of 2,549 female emancipated youths.

Extended Independent Living Program

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- In Calendar Year 2004, the teen parent birth rate for 19 year olds was 74.8 per 1,000 women.
- SB 436 is a state mandate; there is no county cost.

METHODOLOGY:

For FYs 2010-11 and 2011-12, the funding is held to the Budget Act of 2010 Appropriation.

FUNDING:

This premise is funded 100 percent GF.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$15,166	\$15,166
Federal	0	0
State	15,166	15,166
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Chafee Post Secondary Education & Training Vouchers

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the amount of the federal grant for Chafee Post Secondary Education and Training Vouchers. This funding is provided under the Educational and Training Vouchers (ETV) program which is part of the Chafee Foster Care Independence Program (CFCIP).

The Foster Care Independence Act of 1999, Public Law 107-133, amended Section 477 of the Social Security Act to provide states with flexible funding to design and conduct education and training voucher programs for youth who age out of foster care. This can assist youth with the development of skills necessary to lead independent and productive lives. The purpose of this program is to make available vouchers of up to \$5,000 per year per youth for education and training, including post secondary training and education, to eligible youth who have aged out of foster care.

Individuals eligible to receive vouchers under this program are: (1) youth otherwise eligible for services under the state CFCIP program; (2) youth adopted from foster care after attaining age 16; and (3) youth participating in the voucher program on their 21st birthday, until they turn 23 years old, as long as they are enrolled in a post secondary education or training program and are making satisfactory progress toward completion of that program.

Assembly Bill (AB) 1808 (Section 5.1) added \$5.7 million General Fund (GF) to assist students who are current and former foster youth, for career and technical training or traditional college courses.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 2003.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The Foster Care Independence Act of 1999, Public Law 107-133, Section 477 of the Social Security Act, as amended.
- Funding is based on the federal grant award for ETV.
- The final grant for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2010 is \$6,486,023.
- The estimated grant for FFY 2011 is \$6,486,023.
- Future funding will be appropriated on an annual basis pending congressional authorization.
- A 20 percent match of the total cost is required. The match may be cash or in-kind contributions. The match has been historically funded through the "Emancipated Foster Youth Stipend" premise.

METHODOLOGY:

This premise reflects the federal grant amount plus an additional \$5.7 million GF included to support AB 1808 activities.

FUNDING:

This premise is funded 100 percent with a federal grant award. AB 1808 activities are funded with 100 percent GF.

Chafee Post Secondary Education & Training Vouchers

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$12,186	\$12,186
Federal	6,486	6,486
State	5,700	5,700
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Transitional Housing for Foster Youth

DESCRIPTION:

The Transitional Housing Placement Program (THPP) and Transitional Housing Program Plus (THP-Plus) offers foster youth emancipating from the foster care system and youth who have already emancipated from foster care the experience of learning basic life skills while living on their own under general supervision. These programs provide a safety net of services to assure attainment of educational and employment goals. Assembly Bill (AB) 427 expanded the THPP age range for participation from 17 to 18 years of age to 16 to 18 years of age and for the new THP-Plus program to ages 18 to 21. It also enabled additional counties to participate in THPP and THP-Plus by providing a new rate-setting methodology. Effective January 1, 2006, AB 824 (Chapter 636, Statutes of 2005) raised the age limit for receipt of THP-Plus services by an emancipated foster youth to 24 years of age.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

AB 427 implemented on January 1, 2002.

AB 1119 implemented on January 1, 2003.

AB 824 (Chapter 636, Statutes of 2005) implemented on January 1, 2006.

AB 1808 (Chapter 75, Statutes of 2006) implemented on July 12, 2006.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Health and Safety Code 1559.110 and Welfare and Institutions Code sections 11400, 11403.2, 11403.3, 16522 and 16522.1.
- The THPP maximum rate is 75 percent of the group home rate. The THP-Plus rate is 70 percent of the county's group home average grant.
- The estimate includes a \$5 million General Fund (GF) reduction for THP- Plus.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 this premise will benefit from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)
- Beginning in FY 2011-12, \$876,000 of the THP-Plus GF portion will be transferred to the Extend Foster Care (FC), Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (Kin-GAP), Adoption Assistance Program (AAP) Benefits (AB-12) premise.
- In FY 2011-12, the THP-Plus Participating Tracking System costs will revert from the THP-Plus Participating Tracking System premise to the THP-Plus premise. This change is due to the John Burton Foundation's decision to no longer gift their tracking system.

METHODOLOGY:

Funding is based on counties' approved rates multiplied by the number of approved beds.

FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of federal financial participation based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage rate, for those cases meeting federal eligibility criteria. The federal Title IV-E funding is available for youth ages 16 to 18, who are served under the THPP.

Transitional Housing for Foster Youth

FUNDING (CONTINUED):

Youth ages 18 to 24 are ineligible to receive services which include federal funds, but are served under the THP-Plus. The nonfederal share of cost is shared 40 percent GF and 60 percent county for THPP and 100 percent GF for THP-Plus.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The change in the Current Year is due to ARRA savings. The change in the Budget Year is due to an increase in the amount diverted to the Extend FC, KG, AAP Benefits (AB12) premise.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to \$876,000 that will be diverted to the Extend FC, KG, AAP Benefits (AB 12) premise.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2010-11	2011-12
Total		
Total	\$49,713	\$48,837
Federal	5,214	5,188
State	39,327	38,461
County	5,172	5,188
Reimbursements	0	0
THPP		
Total	\$13,835	\$13,835
Federal	5,188	5,188
State	3,459	3,459
County	5,188	5,188
Reimbursements	0	0
ARRA-FMAP Increase		
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	26	0
State	-10	0
County	-16	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Transitional Housing for Foster Youth

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

THP-Plus Net Impact	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$35,878	\$35,002
Federal	0	0
State	35,878	35,002
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0
 THP-Plus	 2010-11	 2011-12
Total	\$35,878	\$35,878
Federal	0	0
State	35,878	35,878
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0
 Extend FC, KG AAP Benefits (AB 12)	 2010-11	 2011-12
Total	\$0	\$-876
Federal	0	0
State	0	876
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Emancipated Foster Youth Stipends

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs to provide special needs stipends for emancipating foster youth. The program can assist emancipating foster youth with finding affordable housing, text books for college or vocational training, employment searches, emergency personal needs, and bus vouchers. County Welfare Departments are responsible for providing these services. Historically, a portion of this amount was used as match for the Chafee Post Secondary Education and Training Vouchers.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: The Budget Act of 2000.

METHODOLOGY:

The Budget Act of 2000 designated the General Fund (GF) support levels.

FUNDING:

This program is funded 100 percent GF.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Services	County Services
Total	\$3,602	\$3,602
Federal	0	0
State	3,602	3,602
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Recruitment and Retention of Social Workers

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to fund a contract with Cooperative Personnel Services/Merit System Services to help recruit and retain social workers in 30 small counties. Due to the continued difficulties of hiring and retaining social workers, Merit System Services will work with counties to implement and provide on-going recruitment efforts and career development plans to increase and retain the number of social workers in the smaller counties.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2001.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The recruitment and career development plans were designed during Fiscal Year (FY) 2000-01.

METHODOLOGY:

The funding for this premise reflects the amount of the contract with Merit System Services.

FUNDING:

This premise is eligible for federal Title IV-E funding. After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and of 66 percent for FY 2011-12, the costs are then shared 50 percent federal and 50 percent General Fund (GF). Nonfederally-eligible costs are funded with 100 percent GF.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The change in the Budget Year is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$269	\$269
Federal	94	89
State	175	180
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for the recruitment, special training, and respite care for specially recruited and trained foster family providers caring for children with medical problems related to drug or alcohol exposure or to Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS). Originally established as a demonstration project by Senate Bill (SB) 1173 (Chapter 1385, Statutes of 1989) and Assembly Bill (AB) 2268 (Chapter 1437, Statutes of 1989), the program was extended by SB 1050 (Chapter 296, Statutes of 1993) and made into a permanent program in 1997 by AB 67 (Chapter 606, Statutes of 1997). AB 2037 (Chapter 799, Statutes of 2000) revised the age for children participating in this program from age three to age five for those counties that have participated in the program for at least three years.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1989.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16525.10 through 16525.30.
- This program is available to any county requesting participation pursuant to established procedures and to the extent funds are available. Currently, there are nine counties that are participating (Alameda, Butte, Contra Costa, Monterey, San Diego, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz, and Shasta).
- This estimate reflects costs for only the eight non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.

METHODOLOGY:

The total program costs are fixed at \$5,022,583.

FUNDING:

Respite care is funded 70 percent General Fund (GF) and 30 percent county funds.

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, training and recruitment components are funded with 75 percent and 50 percent federal Title IV-E funds, respectively. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a change in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There was a decrease in the federally eligible components and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$5,022	\$5,022
Federal	1,606	1,495
State	2,391	2,469
County	1,025	1,058
Reimbursements	0	0

Dual Agency – Supplement to the Rate

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of county social workers to complete “Supplement to the Rate” questionnaires and eligibility forms to be used for determining eligibility for, and the appropriate level of, a supplement to the rate based on the extraordinary care and supervision needs of a dual agency child. The criteria for children to be eligible for the supplement to the rate and the instructions to administer the program were released in All County Letter No. 08-54 on December 1, 2008.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented retroactively to July 1, 2007.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Senate Bill 84 (Chapter 177, Statutes of 2008).
- The estimate reflects costs for only the Child Welfare Services program since the impact to the Adoption Assistance, Foster Care, and Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment programs are now part of the caseload trends and are no longer estimated separately.
- The estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- It is estimated that 236 new cases will enter dual agency status and require additional social worker activities.
- The estimate assumes an average of 4.75 hours of social worker time to complete the “Supplement to the Rate – Questionnaire” and “Supplement to the Rate – Eligibility Form.”
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

The caseload is multiplied by the hours required to fill out additional forms, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

Dual Agency – Supplement to the Rate

EXPENDITURES:

(In 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$81	\$81
Federal	28	28
State	37	37
County	16	16
Reimbursements	0	0

Foster Parent Training and Recruitment

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for the enhanced statewide Foster Parent Training and Recruitment Program. As part of the Foster Care Initiative, Assembly Bill (AB) 2129 (Chapter 1089, Statutes of 1993), required the California Department of Social Services to develop and implement an expanded Foster Parent Training and Recruitment Program. The expanded program provides specialized training for foster parents of children with special care needs, and specific recruitment activities for minority and sibling placements.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1994.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 903.8.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.

METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is based on the Budget Act of 2010 Appropriation level.

FUNDING:

After applying the federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12 costs are shared 75 percent federal and 25 percent nonfederal for the training costs, and 50 percent federal and 50 percent nonfederal for the recruitment costs. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent GF. The funds are evenly distributed to each component of the program.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a change in the federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a change in the federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11 County Admin.	2011-12 County Admin.
Total	\$2,416	\$2,410
Federal	1,075	1,041
State	1,341	1,369
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Foster and Adoptive Family Recruitment Campaign

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects funding to launch a seven to ten county recruitment campaign to increase the number of available quality foster parents. The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) is required in the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) Program Improvement Plan (PIP) to develop and initiate a statewide campaign to recruit and retain resource (foster and adoptive) families. The PIP requires this campaign to be launched by December 2010 in order to avoid fiscal penalties. CDSS will utilize the funds to support the development and initiation of statewide recruitment strategies on a roll-out basis, which includes providing fiscal support to counties that will implement changes at the county level.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2010.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Seven to ten counties will participate in Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and FY 2011-12. These counties will develop and test the strategies identified:

- Website Augmentation – The preliminary costs associated with augmenting the website, increased administration and security.
- Adoption Navigators – To expand the number of part-time navigators who will handle the increased volume due to website augmentation.
- Contract Services – To expand the existing contract services to include providing assistance to counties participating in the Recruitment and Retention Pilot Program. The services would consist of offering support and guidance by responding via phone, internet, and/or mail and providing information on choosing an adoption or foster family agency.
- Printing – The premise request is for 20,000 flyers and 20,000 brochures utilized for foster and adoptive recruitment efforts.
- Develop and implement New Curriculum for Social Worker Customer Service – To improve interaction and relationships to current and potential foster and adoptive families.

METHODOLOGY:

The total cost is based on anticipated contract costs.

FUNDING:

After applying the federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 66 percent for FY 2011-12, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in the federal discount rate.

Foster and Adoptive Family Recruitment Campaign

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$185	\$185
Federal	65	62
State	120	123
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Minor Parent Services and Investigations

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for a program designed to discourage teen pregnancy and encourage appropriate parenting of teen parents and their children. As established by Assembly Bill 908 (Chapter 304, Statutes of 1995), the guidelines require pregnant and parenting teens to live with their parents or legal guardians as a condition for receiving welfare benefits unless specific conditions exist. Teen parents not living at home would need to live in an appropriate supervised setting. Minor Parent Services (MPS) will be provided, if deemed necessary.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The investigative part of this premise implemented on May 1, 1997.

The MPS part of this premise implemented on June 1, 1997.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) sections 11254, 16504(b), and 16506.
- It is assumed that any situations of abuse or neglect under W&IC section 300 requiring a foster care living arrangement resulting from this investigation are already reflected in Child Welfare Services (CWS) and Foster Care caseload trends.
- It is assumed that a social worker will spend four hours investigating each case. The four hours include one and one-half hours each for two client contacts (teen parent and the teen parent's parent(s) or legal guardian), including interviews and documentation. An additional hour is allocated for travel and time to prepare a report of the social worker's findings.
- Based on historical family maintenance data, it is assumed that minor parents (mostly those 17 years of age) will be allowed to form their own assistance units (AUs) and receive MPS. The estimated number of minor parents approved for their own AUs at age 17 is based on application survey data. An average of six months of services is estimated for each case.

METHODOLOGY:

The total funding for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 is being held at the Budget Act of 2010 Appropriation level.

FUNDING:

The costs of performing the investigations and providing MPS are eligible for 50 percent federal funding under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant. All nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. There is no net change in the Budget Year, but there is a change between the investigations and MPS costs based on actual expenditures.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change in the combined total. However, the investigations and MPS costs changed based on actual expenditures.

Minor Parent Services and Investigations

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

COMBINED TOTAL:	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$7,097	\$7,097
Federal	3,549	3,549
State	2,483	2,483
County	1,065	1,065
Reimbursements	0	0

Investigations:	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$4,638	\$4,799
Federal	2,319	2,400
State	1,623	1,679
County	696	720
Reimbursements	0	0

Minor Parent Services:	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$2,459	\$2,298
Federal	1,230	1,149
State	860	804
County	369	345
Reimbursements	0	0

Foster Care Infant Rate (SB 500 Amended by SB 720)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 500 (Chapter 630, Statutes of 2005) and SB 720 (Chapter 475, Statutes of 2007). SB 500 made changes in the way foster care providers are paid for teen parents in placement with their child. It allows for a separate full foster care payment to be paid for the care of a child living in the same foster care facility as that child's minor parent, provided federal financial participation is available and both the child and parent are dependents of the court and receiving reunification services. It creates a new placement option called "whole family foster home," in which care and supervision are provided to dependent teen parents and their non-court dependent children, to ensure the teen parents develop skills necessary to provide a safe, stable, and permanent home for their children. It requires the development of a written "shared responsibility plan" to be created by the foster caregiver and the teen parent in a whole family foster home, and would provide a \$200 monthly payment above the current infant supplement for the added care and supervision provided by the foster caregiver to the teen parent and child, pursuant to the shared responsibility plan. SB 720 clarifies that Group Homes will receive the infant supplemental rate for both dependent and non dependent infants who are placed with their dependent mothers rather than a full Group Home rate for the infant. SB 720 also allows infants and mothers living with Non-Related Legal Guardians and related guardians in the Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment program to be eligible for the increased benefits established in SB 500.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

SB 500 implemented on January 1, 2006.

SB 720 which amends SB 500 implemented on January 1, 2008.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The impact to assistance payments under Item 101 is now in the caseload and grant trends and is no longer estimated separately.
- It is assumed that an additional two hours of social work time is required to develop the written "shared responsibility plan." The caseload for the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties is estimated at 146 cases. The social worker cost per hour is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

The caseload is multiplied by the additional social worker hours per case and multiplied by the social worker hourly rate.

Foster Care Infant Rate (SB 500 Amended by SB 720)

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$22	\$22
Federal	8	8
State	10	10
County	4	4
Reimbursements	0	0

Kinship Support Services

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for the grants-in-aid program that provides start-up and expansion funds for local kinship support service programs. As designated by Assembly Bill (AB) 1193 (Chapter 794, Statutes of 1997), the Kinship Support Services Program (KSSP) is to be conducted by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) with the initial grants being awarded in July 1998 to eight counties. Currently, there are 20 counties participating in the program. These programs are to provide community-based family support services to kinship (relative) caregivers and the children who are placed in their homes by the juvenile court or who are at risk of dependency or delinquency.

Effective Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07, the KSSP was augmented by \$2.5 million and all counties were allowed to apply for the KSSP funds. The application process requires each interested county to submit a comprehensive proposal outlining how many relative caretakers reside in their county, what services will be provided to relative caretakers and the children in their care, how the county will develop the necessary community supports, how many relative caretakers and children will be served, and what the county outcome improvement goals are for the program. The proposals must also include a description of how each county will measure the success and cost-effectiveness of their program, and how the county will report these measures to CDSS.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1998.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16605.
- The participating counties for FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 are: Alameda, Contra Costa, El Dorado, Kern, Los Angeles, Monterey, Napa, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Sonoma, Stanislaus, and Ventura.

METHODOLOGY:

The estimate reflects the amount contained in AB 1193 and the 2006 Budget Act.

FUNDING:

This premise is funded 100 percent with General Fund.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

Kinship Support Services

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$4,000	\$4,000
Federal	0	0
State	4,000	4,000
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Kinship/Foster Care Emergency Funds

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide emergency funds to relative caregivers and foster parents. The program primarily offers one-time assistance for necessary housing needs, such as extra beds and clothing. Short-term support services, such as crisis counseling, are also provided to prevent children from entering or re-entering the child welfare system.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The Budget Act of 2010.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The California Department of Social Services received policy clarification from the federal Department of Health and Human Services that administrative costs for beds, cribs, and smoke detectors that are needed in order to license or approve a foster family home are allowable under Title IV-E.

METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is held at the Budget Act of 2010 Appropriation level.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The change in the Budget Year is due to a change in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,422	\$1,422
Federal	498	483
State	924	939
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Child Welfare Services/Case Management System Staff Development

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to fund staff development for the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS) which was implemented as a result of Senate Bill 370 (Chapter 1294, Statutes of 1989). The estimate includes costs for five training components plus costs to maintain three training tools in order to continue to provide a statewide CWS/CMS training curriculum and classes. This statewide training promotes user continuity and consistency to meet Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System requirements.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1997.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16501.5.
- The estimate includes training costs for all new users as a result of user growth and staff turnover.
- The cost per hour of training is \$48.07 for each fiscal year.
- The estimate assumes an 11.5 percent staff turnover rate.
- There are 15,819 budgeted users for each fiscal year.
- The estimate includes costs for five training components:
 - **New User Training** – provides 44 hours of basic training for newly hired staff as a result of staff turnover.
 - **Intermediate/Advanced Training** – provides 16 hours of training to service providers on the more difficult tasks not covered in the new user training.
 - **Management/Supervisory Training** – provides 16 hours of training to management on the supervisory process of approvals and program management reports.
 - **System Support Training** – provides 24 hours of training to newly hired system support staff as a result of caseload growth and staff turnover in order to assist other users as needed.
 - **Database Training** – provides 24 hours of training to staff responsible for extracting and interpreting caseload data.
- Costs are also included for statewide contracted training needs.

Child Welfare Services/Case Management System Staff Development

METHODOLOGY:

Costs are calculated for each training component by multiplying the number of users being trained by the number of hours of training at the hourly cost for training. Costs are then added for the statewide contracted training needs.

Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and FY 2011-12: (1,819 New Users x 44 hours x \$48.07) + (1,559 Intermediate/Advanced Users x 16 hours x \$48.07) + (195 Management/Supervisory Users x 16 hours x \$48.07) + (55 System Support Users x 24 hours x \$48.07) + (29 Database Users x 24 hours x \$48.07). For the statewide contract costs, \$3,000,000 is added in each FY in order to meet the total contract commitment.

FUNDING:

Costs are shared according to California's federally approved Cost Allocation Plan (CAP) which allocates costs to all benefiting CWS programs based on statewide county worker time study hours. After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 66 percent for FY 2011-12, federally eligible costs are shared 75 percent federal and 25 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent GF and 30 percent county, with the exception of statewide contract costs which is 100 percent GF.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change for the Current Year. The Budget Year (BY) change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY costs are shared based on an updated CAP, and the foster care federal discount rate has decreased.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$8,294	\$8,294
Federal	4,283	4,099
State	2,824	2,961
County	755	790
Reimbursements	432	444

Supportive and Therapeutic Options Program (STOP)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs for providing expanded therapeutic day services as an alternative to placement in foster care and as a means of reunifying children in foster care placement with their families. These services are provided to families with children and youth returning from out-of-home placement or at-risk of such placements that cannot access services through current mental health services or other funding mechanisms. Services target a broader number of children than the current child welfare services population, such as children and youth at-risk of placement and those exiting foster care. Funds provide supportive and therapeutic services to prevent placement in out-of-home care and/or provide aftercare services to facilitate a successful transition to home or community from out-of-home care placements.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented in August 1998.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16500, 16508.2, and 16508.3.
- Total funding is fixed at \$14,220,000.
- Based on the Department of Mental Health's annual cost for mental health services per child of \$6,369 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and \$6,505 in FY 2011-12, 2,233 children can be served in FY 2010-11 and 2,186 children can be served in FY 2011-12.

METHODOLOGY:

Funding reflects the fixed amount.

FUNDING:

Total costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$14,220	\$14,220
Federal	0	0
State	9,954	9,954
County	4,266	4,266
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Group Home Monthly Visits

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of providing monthly visits to all foster care children placed in Group Homes (GHs), both in-state and out-of-state. This premise was authorized by Senate Bill 933 (Chapter 311, Statutes of 1998).

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1998.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16516.5.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The in-state GH caseload is projected to be 5,732 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and 4,698 for FY 2011-12 based on data as reported on the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System. The out-of-state GH caseload is estimated at 162 for FY 2010-11 and 225 for FY 2011-12.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.
- For the out-of-state placements, it is assumed that an average of two cases can be visited per trip.
- All GH placements will receive ten additional visits per year.
- In-state visits will take an average of two hours per visit and out-of-state visits will take an average of 12 hours to visit two cases.
- Based on caseload data for in-state GH placements, 2,934 cases are placed out-of-county for FY 2010-11, and 2,476 cases for FY 2011-12. These cases have been budgeted to include an additional two hours of travel time.
- Out-of-state per diem costs are estimated at \$124 and out-of-state travel costs are estimated at \$500.

METHODOLOGY:

The in-state costs for ten visits are calculated using the in-state GH caseload for two hours per visit multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.

An additional two hours are calculated for the in-state, out-of-county placements at the hourly cost of a social worker.

The out-of-state costs for ten visits are calculated using the out-of-state GH caseload divided by two (two cases per visit) for 12 hours per visit multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.

Per diem and travel costs are added for each out-of-state visit.

Group Home Monthly Visits

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The change in the Budget Year is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is a decrease in the in-state caseload, and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$9,960	\$8,863
Federal	3,486	3,014
State	6,474	5,849
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Caregiver Court Filing (SB 1667)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost for county social workers to instruct caregivers on how to file a Caregiver Information Form with the court at each status review hearing as a result of Senate Bill (SB) 1667 (Chapter 389, Statutes of 2006). This bill requires a social worker to provide the child's caregiver a copy of the Caregiver Information Form in the caregiver's primary language when available and information regarding filing the form with the court.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The premise implemented on January 1, 2007.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: SB 1667 (Chapter 389, Statutes of 2006).
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- Status review hearings are held every six months.
- The foster family home, small family home, relative home, and guardian home caseload is estimated at 23,489 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and 22,493 for FY 2011-12.
- Ten percent of the caseload will submit the Caregiver Information Form, requiring 15 minutes of social worker instruction time.
- The average hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

The caseload is multiplied by 0.25 of the hourly cost of a social worker which is then multiplied by two hearings per year.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

Caregiver Court Filing (SB 1667)

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$85	\$82
Federal	30	28
State	55	54
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Criminal Records Check for FR (AB 1774)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to conduct background checks on parents wishing to reunify with their child as a result of Assembly Bill (AB) 1774 (Chapter 726, Statutes of 2006). AB 1774 expands the purposes for which criminal offender record information can be obtained to include assessing a parent's suitability to reunify with their child, provided that the parent's consent to fingerprint submission has been obtained. Courts would be allowed to consider the criminal history of a parent at review and permanency hearings.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The premise implemented on January 1, 2007.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: AB 1774 (Chapter 726, Statutes of 2006).
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- Family Reunification (FR) cases can be subject to up to three review and permanency hearings before termination of parental rights is considered, however, it is assumed that criminal records checks will only be performed once.
- The FR average monthly caseload is projected at 13,356 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and 13,109 for FY 2011-12.
- The cost for a Department of Justice background check is \$32 along with a Live Scan fingerprinting fee of \$16 per check.
- The Federal Bureau of Investigations background check is \$24.

METHODOLOGY:

The FR average monthly caseload is multiplied by \$72.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to an increase in caseload.

Criminal Records Check for FR (AB 1774)

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$962	\$944
Federal	337	321
State	625	623
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Background Checks

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost associated with conducting background checks prior to placing children in the home of a relative, or the home of any other person who is not a licensed foster parent. Pursuant to Assembly Bill 1695 (Chapter 653, Statutes of 2001), all unlicensed foster parents must meet the same standards set forth in regulations for the licensing of foster family homes. Therefore, all unlicensed foster parents will be subject to a background check to be conducted through the Child Abuse Central Index, the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigations.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1999.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 361.4.
- The caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 is 20,758 based on new placement data for FY 2008-09. The caseload for FY 2011-12 is 19,558 based on new placement data for FY 2009-10.
- Based on information from the California Welfare Directors Association, it is assumed that an average of 1.56 children is placed per home.
- It is assumed that an average of two persons in the home will require background checks.
- The cost for the Child Abuse Central Index check is estimated at \$15 per check.
- The cost for a Department of Justice background check is \$32 and there is a Live Scan fingerprint fee of \$16 per check.
- The Federal Bureau of Investigations background check is \$24.

METHODOLOGY:

The costs are calculated by dividing the caseload by number of placements per home, multiplied by two persons in the home requiring background checks, multiplied by the cost for background checks.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 66 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

Background Checks

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The change in the Budget Year is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$2,315	\$2,181
Federal	810	720
State	1,505	1,461
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Relative Home Approvals

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost associated with conducting an in-home approval prior to placing children in the home of a relative or the home of a non-relative extended family member (Initial Approvals). This premise also reflects the cost of conducting an annual visit for continued approval of a relative home (Annual Approvals). Assembly Bill (AB) 1695 (Chapter 653, Statutes of 2001) requires the county welfare department to conduct an in-home inspection to assess the safety of the home and the ability of the relative to care for the child's needs. The bill stipulates that the standards used to evaluate and grant or deny approval of the home of the relative shall be the same standards set forth in regulations for the licensing of foster family homes. However, all homes will require an annual reassessment as opposed to targeted visits for continued licensure of foster family homes.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2002.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 309(d).
- The initial assessment caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 is 20,758 based on new placement data for FY 2008-09. The initial assessment caseload for FY 2011-12 is 19,558 based on new placement data for FY 2009-10.
- The existing caseload for FY 2010-11 is 23,528 based on placement data for November 2009. The existing caseload for FY 2011-12 is 22,185 based on placement data for December 2010.
- Based on information from the California Welfare Directors Association (CWDA), it is assumed that an average of 1.56 children is placed per home.
- Based on information from CWDA, it is assumed to take an average of nine and a half hours to complete the additional activities associated with conducting an initial approval equivalent to the licensure of a foster family home. This includes 30 minutes to check the Licensing Administrative Action Records System (LAARS) as part of the background check process.
- It is estimated that approximately one percent of LAARS searches of new applicants will result in a match, with each match requiring four hours to complete the document review.
- It is assumed to take an average of three hours to conduct an annual visit for re-approval of the home.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.

Relative Home Approvals

METHODOLOGY:

Costs for the initial assessments are calculated by 1) Dividing the caseload by the number of children per home, multiplied by the number of hours for approval, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker, plus 2) Multiplying the number of LAARS matches of new applicants by the additional hours of document review, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.

Costs for annual re-approvals are then calculated by multiplying the re-approval caseload, multiplied by the time to conduct annual visit, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 66 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

Initial Approvals:	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$9,215	\$8,683
Federal	3,225	2,866
State	4,193	4,072
County	1,797	1,745
Reimbursements	0	0

Relative Home Approvals

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

Annual Approvals:	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$3,285	\$3,097
Federal	1,150	1,022
State	1,495	1,453
County	640	622
Reimbursements	0	0

COMBINED TOTAL:	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$12,500	\$11,780
Federal	4,375	3,888
State	5,688	5,525
County	2,437	2,367
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Multiple Relative Home Approvals

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost associated with conducting additional approvals when more than one relative or non-related extended family member is seeking to have related foster children placed with them. These additional approvals of all willing relatives or non-related extended family members are necessary in order to fairly establish viable placement options and to better enable the state to meet the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act requirement that approval of relative homes be in compliance with foster family home licensing/approval standards.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on December 1, 2002.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 309(d).
- The new placement caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 is 20,758 based on data for FY 2008-09. The new placement caseload for FY 2011-12 is 19,558 based on data for FY 2009-10.
- Based on information from the California Welfare Directors Association (CWDA), it is assumed that an average of 1.56 children is placed per home.
- It is assumed that 30 percent of the placements have more than one party interested in receiving the placement.
- It is assumed that there are two to three (2.5 average) interested parties per placement. Therefore, since the "Relative Home Approvals" premise already provides for one assessment, there is an average of 1.5 additional homes that require approvals.
- Based on information from CWDA, it is assumed to take an average of 15.5 hours to assess each home for approval. This includes an additional 30 minutes to check the Licensing Administrative Action Records System (LAARS) as part of the background check process.
- It is assumed that approximately one percent of LAARS searches of new applicants will result in a match, with each match requiring four hours to complete the document review.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

The number of approvals to be conducted is calculated by dividing the caseload by the average placements per home, then multiplying by the percentage of placements with multiple interests, multiplied by the additional homes requiring approval. Annual costs are calculated by multiplying the number of approvals by the number of hours per approval multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker, then adding, the amount determined by multiplying the number of LAARS matches by the additional hours of review by the hourly cost of a social worker.

Multiple Relative Home Approvals

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 66 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$6,755	\$6,365
Federal	2,364	2,100
State	3,074	2,985
County	1,317	1,280
Reimbursements	0	0

Grievance Review for Relatives

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost associated with providing a review process upon request for relatives seeking to have related foster children placed with them but who have been determined not to meet approval standards established by law and regulation. Making a grievance review available to relatives disapproved prior to placement is necessary to afford due process through an objective review of the basis for the disapproval and to better enable the state to meet the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act requirement that approval of relative homes be in compliance with foster family home licensing/approval standards.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2003.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 309(d).
- The new placement caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 is 20,758 based on data for FY 2008-09. The new placement caseload for FY 2011-12 is 19,558 based on data for FY 2009-10.
- Based on information from the California Welfare Directors Association, it is assumed that an average of 1.56 children is placed per home.
- It is assumed that 30 percent of the placements have more than one party interested in receiving the placement.
- It is assumed that there are two to three (2.5 average) interested parties per placement.
- It is assumed that 45 percent of homes will be disapproved.
- It is assumed that 20 percent of those whose homes are disapproved will request a review.
- It is assumed that it will take an average of eight hours to review each case.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

The number of reviews to be conducted is calculated by dividing the caseload by the average placements per home, then multiplying by the percentage of placements with multiple interests, multiplied by the average interested parties per placement, then multiplying by the percent of homes that are disapproved and the percent of those requesting a review. Annual costs are calculated by multiplying the number of reviews by the number of hours per review multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 66 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

Grievance Review for Relatives

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$522	\$491
Federal	183	162
State	237	230
County	102	99
Reimbursements	0	0

Live Scan Technology

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to maintain Live Scan machines in the 58 county child welfare services agencies for the Foster Care program. Before a child can be placed in a foster home or an unlicensed relative or guardian home, caregivers must clear a criminal record check. Live Scan technology provides the capability to do instantaneous criminal record checks from fingerprints. Providing and maintaining Live Scan machines to the child welfare agencies allows for immediate onsite fingerprint processing.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Assembly Bill 1740 (Chapter 52, Statutes of 2000).
- The 58 counties were provided funds to purchase 100 Live Scan machines in Fiscal Year (FY) 2000-01.
- Costs are negotiated and contracted with a Live Scan vendor by each of the counties.
- Contract costs for on-going maintenance were based on an existing Live Scan contract for Community Care Licensing activities.

METHODOLOGY:

Contract costs are budgeted to provide on-going maintenance.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 66 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The change in the Budget Year is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

Live Scan Technology

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,200	\$1,200
Federal	420	396
State	780	804
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Health Oversight and Coordination (P.L. 110-351)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise ensures California's compliance with the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act (P.L. 110-351), which requires states to specify in their Title IV-B plans how they determine and meet the health, mental health, developmental, and dental care needs of children in foster care. This premise increases funding and the number of nurses for the Health Care Program for Children in Foster Care (HPCFC) to a level at which medical case management services can be provided by counties for all children in foster care.

Public health nurses (PHN) supported by the HPCFC provide case management services for children in foster care with the goal of supporting their physical, mental, dental, and developmental well-being. Placed in county child welfare and juvenile probation offices, HPCFC PHNs participate in medical care planning and coordination, collect and review health information, determine the need for referrals and follow-up care, arrange for health, mental health and dental assessments, expedite referrals for specialty care, advocate for the health needs of the child, and ensure provider linkages. In close parallel to these functions, P.L. 110-351 states that California's Title IV-B plan must address how children's health needs will be monitored and treated, how medical information on each child will be updated and appropriately shared, coordinated strategies to identify and respond to the health, mental health and dental needs of children, and steps to ensure continuity of health care services.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2010.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act (P.L. 110-351).
- Caseloads are based on actual data from the previous 12 months.
- The projected foster care caseload for 58 counties includes Foster Family Homes, Foster Family Agencies, and Group Home youth. The caseload is 53,712 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and 45,857 for FY 2011-12.
- The foster care caseload per PHN is based on a 200 to 1 ratio.
- The cost for a PHN is \$130,620.
- This program receives 75 percent federal Title XIX funding with 25 percent General Fund (GF). The GF is reflected in the California Department of Social Services' (CDSS) budget and, through an interagency agreement, provided to the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS).

METHODOLOGY:

The projected foster care caseload is divided by the number of annual cases per PHN, then multiplied by the unit cost of a PHN to determine the total cost of the program ($45,857 \div 200 \times \$130,620$). The total funds are multiplied by 25 percent to calculate the amount reflected in the CDSS' budget and the remaining 75 percent of the funds are reflected in the DHCS' budget. The total includes a \$1 million reduction to GF consistent with the FY 2010-11 Appropriation.

Health Oversight and Coordination (P.L. 110-351)

FUNDING:

This program is eligible for enhanced federal Title XIX funding of 75 percent with a match of 25 percent GF.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The change in the Budget Year is due to an increase in caseload.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in caseload.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$7,770	\$6,487
Federal	0	0
State	7,770	6,487
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

County Self-Assessment and System Improvement Planning (SIP) Development

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide funding to counties to support the additional administrative responsibility related to the planning and coordination of the periodic county Child Welfare Services (CWS) performance self-assessments and annual SIPs as required by Assembly Bill (AB) 636 (Chapter 678, Statutes of 2002). Self-assessments and SIPs are critical and mandated components of the new CWS outcomes and accountability systems that require full and continuous participation by the public, service recipients, providers, courts, and agencies participating in CWS and are necessary to ensure a comprehensive, efficient, and non-duplicative approach to CWS assessment, design and operations.

Additional staff resources are necessary for the new function of identifying, selecting, updating membership, providing information, and coordinating the activities of the wide range of participants that include: advocates, the general public, law enforcement, courts, health and mental health agencies, local education, foster parents, foster youth, service recipient parents, and tribal organizations.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2004.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The annual Budget Act.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- Seventy-eight staff at the social worker level are budgeted to perform these duties.
- The statewide average cost of a social worker is \$129,074.

METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is calculated by multiplying the number of social workers by the statewide average cost of a social worker.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

County Self-Assessment and System Improvement Planning (SIP) Development

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$10,079	\$10,079
Federal	3,528	3,427
State	4,586	4,656
County	1,965	1,996
Reimbursements	0	0

Federal Child & Family Services Review

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects funding for activities related to the preparation and completion of the federal Child and Family Services Review. The funds will be used to hire a contractor to complete research and prepare the Statewide Self Assessment. In addition, funding is needed to support preparation and completion of the onsite review in three counties and development of a Program Improvement Plan (PIP).

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2007.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Contractor costs for assistance with PIP implementation are \$300,000.

METHODOLOGY:

Includes contractor costs of \$300,000 for assistance with PIP implementation.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and 66 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11 County Admin.	2011-12 County Admin.
Total	\$300	\$300
Federal	105	99
State	195	201
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Data Requirements for New Activities

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs related to the additional data requirements associated with the many new mandated activities counties must accomplish to implement the Program Improvement Plan (PIP) and the California Child & Family Services Review process authorized by Assembly Bill 636 (Chapter 678, Statutes of 2002). Counties must review and update data already contained in the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System to ensure the new required data elements are entered into the case files. Counties must also spend additional time entering these additional data requirements in all new cases as they are created. This effort is needed to be able to measure program improvement progress as required by the PIP to avoid federal penalties.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented January 1, 2004.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The Budget Act of 2008.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The estimate reflects costs for new family maintenance and foster care cases.
- The new caseload is 27,627 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 based on actual data for FY 2008-09 and 26,362 for FY 2011-12 based on actual data for FY 2009-10.
- It is assumed that each new case will require 15 minutes for a social worker to enter data.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is calculated by multiplying the caseload by the number of hours per case and then by the hourly cost of a social worker.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

Data Requirements for New Activities

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$501	\$478
Federal	175	162
State	228	221
County	98	95
Reimbursements	0	0

Peer Quality Case Reviews

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost associated with backfilling staff time, travel and per diem costs for social workers and probation officers participating in Peer Quality Case Reviews (PQCR) as required by Assembly Bill 636 (Chapter 678, Statutes of 2001). The purpose of the PQCR is to learn, through intensive examination of county child welfare practice, how to improve child welfare services and practices in California, both in the participating county and in other jurisdictions as well. Without relying on the PQCR as a vehicle for validating the quantitative data contained within each county's County Data Report and Self Assessment, the PQCR should provide another layer of information. Specifically, the PQCR is another mechanism for understanding the key to the child welfare system and social worker practice. While the quantitative data provides integral, population-based information, the PQCR provides a rich and deep understanding of actual practice in the field. In addition, the PQCR goes beyond the County Self-Assessment by incorporating outside expertise, including county peers, to help identify the strengths and weaknesses of county child welfare services delivery systems, and social worker and probation officer practices.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2004.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10601.2.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- There will be 14 counties completing County Welfare Department (CWD) and County Probation Department (CPD) reviews in Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and 20 counties completing CWD and CPD reviews in FY 2011-12.
- Based on information from the County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA), it will require a total of 712 hours of social worker time for each CWD review, which includes staff time for preparation, coordination and training for the reviews and completion and review of reports. Included in the total hours are five full days for eight staff from the county being reviewed, and eight staff from other counties to participate in the reviews.
- It will require a total of 427 hours of probation worker time for each CPD review, which includes staff time for preparation, coordination and training for the reviews and completion and review of reports. It is assumed that each CPD review will take approximately three-fifths the time of a CWD review.
- The hourly cost of a worker is \$72.60.
- The eight workers from other counties will require travel and per diem costs of \$124 per day.
- \$40,000 of state support is included in the premise.

Peer Quality Case Reviews

METHODOLOGY:

The total number of worker hours per review is multiplied by the number of reviews and then by the worker cost per hour. Costs are then added for travel and per diem for eight visiting workers for each of the reviews at \$124 per day. Costs are also added for state support.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund (GF) and 30 percent county, with the exception of state support costs, which are 100 percent GF.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The number of county reviews has increased.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,310	\$1,853
Federal	459	630
State	603	864
County	248	359
Reimbursements	0	0

Child Fatality and Near Fatality Peer Quality Case Reviews (PQCRs)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with PQCRs that includes compiling and publishing reports on all child deaths and near deaths that are caused by suspected child abuse or neglect as required by the federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA). A team will be established to review cases on a monthly basis and compile data for a final report. In addition, the on-site review of high profile cases will be contracted out.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2007.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: CAPTA
- Eight county staff will meet monthly in Sacramento for two days.
- The average hourly cost for a social worker is \$72.60.
- Airfare is estimated at \$100 and per diem costs are estimated at \$124 per day.
- On-site contracting costs are \$100,000.

METHODOLOGY:

The number of staff is multiplied by the annual number of hours and then multiplied by the average cost per hour. Costs are added for travel and per diem and for on-site contracting.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and 66 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

Child Fatality and Near Fatality Peer Quality Case Reviews (PQCRs)

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$245	\$245
Federal	86	81
State	111	115
County	48	49
Reimbursements	0	0

Statewide Standardized Training

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the additional costs associated with the need for counties to fill behind county social workers and supervisors who must attend additional days of training, as required under the statewide standardized common core curriculum for all current and new child welfare workers and their supervisors, and probation workers. The additional training days resulted from California's negotiation of the federal Children and Family Services Review (CFSR) Program Improvement Plan (PIP) which was aimed at improving outcomes for children in foster care. The PIP required that the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) develop regulations to mandate the standardized training curricula that will result in four additional days of training. The standardized curricula and additional days of training were also added to the Training Plan section of the Title IV-B State Plan. The standardized curricula was developed in collaboration with the Statewide Training and Education Committee, which includes representation from all of the Regional Training Academies (RTA) and the Inter-University Consortium (IUC), the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC), county staff, the tribal community, and other important stakeholders.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2007.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16200 through 16215.
- The additional days of training were required as part of the PIP and Title IV-B Training Plan.
- Funding is based on the number of county Full Time Equivalent (FTEs) who will be attending the additional days of training. For FY 2010-11 and 2011-12, there are 826 new social workers, 118 new social work supervisors, 7,185 existing social workers, 1,026 existing social work supervisors, and 175 existing probation workers who will be attending training.
- New social workers will attend four additional days of initial training and new social work supervisors will attend one additional day of initial training.
- Existing social workers and supervisors will attend 20 hours of continued training annually.
- Existing probation workers will attend three additional days of continued training.
- The hourly cost of a worker is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is based on the total number of FTEs in each county who will be attending the additional days of training multiplied by the number of hours of training. The total hours are then multiplied by the hourly cost of a worker.

Statewide Standardized Training

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 66 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared at 75 percent federal, 25 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The change in the Budget Year is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$14,215	\$14,215
Federal	7,464	7,036
State	4,726	5,025
County	2,025	2,154
Reimbursements	0	0

CWS Differential Response (DR), Safety Assessment (SA) and Permanency & Youth Services (PYS)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects funding for activities related to Differential Response (DR), Safety Assessment (SA), and Permanency and Youth Services (PYS) that were previously identified as separate premises. Beginning at the Child Welfare Services (CWS) Hotline, the new DR intake system provides a more customized response to families through case planning and development, and provides enhanced services to support the specific needs of children and families. The Standardized Safety Assessment System establishes the standards, tools, and practice applications to improve California's safety outcomes. PYS is aimed at increasing permanence and stability for children in the CWS system as well as supporting foster youth as they transition to adulthood.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2005.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- This premise provides funding for continued implementation in ten counties (Contra Costa, Glenn, Humboldt, Placer, Sacramento, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Stanislaus, Tehama, and Trinity) that received funding in Fiscal Year (FY) 2004-05 through other existing fund sources.
- Additional funding is provided for state level contracts for training and technical assistance in support of the DR, SA, and PYS activities.
- It is assumed that a portion of activities for DR are ineligible for federal Title IV-E funding and are funded with 100 percent General Fund (GF).

METHODOLOGY:

The GF amount for the ten counties is \$6,436,000. An additional \$364,000 GF is provided for state contracts.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal for the non-enhanced expenditures and 75 percent enhanced federal Title IV-E training funds and 25 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent GF.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

CWS Differential Response (DR), Safety Assessment (SA) and Permanency & Youth Services (PYS)

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$10,690	\$10,518
Federal	3,890	3,718
State	6,800	6,800
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

CWS Outcome Improvement Project

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects funding for county child welfare and probation agencies to enhance/modify their existing service delivery systems to improve outcomes for children and families consistent with the strategies contained in the county System Improvement Plans (SIPs) approved by each county's Board of Supervisors. These plans are required under the California Child and Family Services Review, pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 636 (Chapter 678, Statutes of 2001). Improvements in the area of safety are a priority. In addition, the eleven Child Welfare Services (CWS) Program Improvement pilot counties can access these funds to support ongoing development of their Standardized Safety Assessment System, Differential Response, and Youth Permanency programs. The California Department of Social Services anticipates that there will be both one-time and ongoing costs for improvements that could include specialized training, equipment, consultant services, enhanced staffing, and expanded service capacity. In addition, AB 1808 (Chapter 75, Statutes of 2006) provided a \$98.6 million augmentation for all counties to be spent flexibly on local priorities identified in the county SIPs.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2005.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing Statute: AB 1808 (Chapter 75, Statutes of 2006).
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The General Fund (GF) for county welfare department CWS Outcome Improvement Project (CWSOIP) activities is \$10.6 million.
- The GF for county probation department CWSOIP activities is \$1.2 million.
- AB 1808 provides an augmentation of \$39.4 million GF.
- For county welfare department CWSOIP activities, 45 percent of the activities are eligible for federal Title IV-E funding.
- For county probation department CWSOIP activities, 100 percent of the activities are eligible for federal Title IV-E funding.

METHODOLOGY:

The CWSOIP funding is added with the CWSOIP Augmentation funding.

FUNDING:

For the CWSOIP, after applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent GF. The CWSOIP Augmentation funding was determined by AB 1808.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

CWS Outcome Improvement Project

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

COMBINED TOTAL:	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$74,967	\$73,938
Federal	23,779	22,750
State	51,188	51,188
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

CWSOIP:	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$14,402	\$14,291
Federal	2,581	2,470
State	11,821	11,821
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

CWSOIP Augmentation:	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$60,565	\$59,647
Federal	21,198	20,280
State	39,367	39,367
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Safe and Timely Interstate Placement of Foster Children Act of 2006

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with Child Welfare Services (CWS) and Adoptions social workers meeting the new 60-day home study time frame requirement of the Safe and Timely Interstate Placement of the Foster Care Act of 2006 (H.R. 5403). Within the 60-days, county social workers must complete a study of a home environment in order to assess the safety and suitability of placing a child in a foster or adoptive home and to develop a report of their findings.

This premise also reflects the cost to support data collection and tracking on an annual basis for out-of-state home study requests to satisfy federal reporting requirements.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2007.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- In early 2009, the California Department of Social Services received instructions from the federal Department of Health and Human Services that the Title IV-B Child and Family Services Plan for Federal Fiscal Year 2010-2014 should include data regarding California's compliance with the out-of-state home study time line requirements imposed by the federal law.
- Authorizing statute: H.R. 5403, pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 703 (Chapter 583, Statutes of 2007), the Family Code Section 7906.5 was amended to ensure that state law included the new federal requirements.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The CWS caseload for the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties from out-of-state is estimated at 856 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and 834 for FY 2011-12.
- The Adoptions caseload from out-of state homes studies performed by counties is estimated at 142 for FY 2010-11 and 158 for FY 2011-12.
- Each CWS home study will take an average of 15.5 hours and each Adoptions home study will take an average of 24 hours. Beginning in FY 2010-11, data collection and tracking will take an average of 0.5 hours per case.
- The average hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

The caseload is multiplied by the hours and then by the hourly social worker cost.

FUNDING:

For CWS, after the foster care federal discount rate of 68 percent is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 70 percent General Fund (GF) and 30 percent county.

For Adoptions, costs are shared 42.09 percent federal and 57.91 GF for FY 2010-11 and 41.38 percent federal and 58.62 percent GF for FY 2011-12.

Safe and Timely Interstate Placement of Foster Children Act of 2006

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

CWS: There is no change in the Current Year (CY). The change in the Budget Year (BY) is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

Adoptions: There is no change in the CY. The change in the BY is due to an increase in caseload.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

For CWS, the change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate and a decrease in caseload.

For Adoptions, the change is due to an increase in caseload.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

Item 151 - CWS	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$994	\$969
Federal	348	329
State	452	448
County	194	192
Reimbursements	0	0

Item 151 - Adoptions	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$252	\$281
Federal	106	116
State	146	165
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with Public Law (P.L.) 109-248, known as the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 which requires that states check child abuse and neglect registries in each state in which prospective foster or adoptive parents, relative caregivers or non-relative extended family members (NREFM) (as well as other adults in the home) have resided in the preceding five years prior to approval for placement of a child. This premise also reflects the costs associated with responding to other states' requests for underlying information about child abuse and neglect reports in California. Senate Bill (SB) 703 (Chapter 583, Statutes of 2007) brings California into conformity with this Act.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2008.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: P.L. 109-248 and SB 703.
- Ten percent of those seeking home approval have resided in another state within the past five years and will require a child abuse and neglect registry check.
- Ten percent of those who have resided in another state within the past five years and have a child abuse and neglect registry check will have a history of child abuse and neglect.
- Social workers, adoption workers, and licensing workers will spend one hour per registry check. When information from other states indicates a history of child abuse and neglect, an additional seven hours will be required to investigate and review the facts of the case.

Child Welfare Services (CWS)

The annual relative and NREFM caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 is 20,758, based on data from FY 2008-09. The annual relative and NREFM caseload for FY 2011-12 is projected to be 19,558, based on new placement data for FY 2009-10.

- Based on information from the California Welfare Directors Association, it is assumed that an average of 1.56 children are placed per home.
- It is assumed that an average of two persons in the home will require a child abuse and neglect registry check in another state.
- The fee charged by other states to check their registries is \$15 per check.
- The number of out of state checks to be performed in FY 2010-11 is 2,661 and for FY 2011-12 is 2,507.
- It is assumed that ten percent of the out of state checks performed will require a total of eight hours of social worker time to check and investigate each case.
- The number of outgoing registry checks that indicate a history of child abuse and neglect is assumed to be the same as the number of incoming requests for underlying case information.

Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Social workers will spend four hours responding to incoming requests for underlying case information.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.

Adoptions

- The number of potentially approved families is 7,141 for FY 2010-11 based on data from FY 2008-09 and 6,837 for FY 2011-12 based on new placement data for FY 2009-10.
- It is assumed that an average of two children will be adopted per home.
- It is assumed that an average of two persons in the home will require a child abuse and neglect registry check in another state.
- The fee charged by other states to check their registries is \$15 per check.
- The number of potentially approved families that lived out of state is 714 for FY 2010-11 and 684 for FY 2011-12.
- It is assumed that ten percent of the out of state checks performed will require an investigation, which will take a social worker eight hours to investigate.
- The number of outgoing registry checks that indicate a history of child abuse and neglect is assumed to be the same as the number of incoming requests for underlying case information.
- Social workers will spend four hours responding to incoming requests for underlying case information.
- The hourly cost of an adoption worker is \$72.31.

Community Care Licensing (CCL)

- The Foster Family Home (FFH) caseload for FY 2010-11 is 1,499, based on new licensing activity for FY 2008-09. The FFH caseload for FY 2011-12 is 1,314 based on new licensing activity for Calendar Year 2010.
- It is assumed that an average of 2.5 persons in the home will require a child abuse and neglect registry check in another state.
- A total of 3,748 registry checks will be performed in FY 2010-11 and 3,285 in FY 2011-12.
- It is assumed that ten percent of the out of state checks performed will require an investigation, which will take a social worker eight hours to investigate.
- The hourly cost of a licensing worker is \$70.68.

Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006

METHODOLOGY:

CWS

The caseload is multiplied by the percentage of those living in another state, multiplied by the number of hours required to complete a registry check, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker. The number of out of state registry checks is multiplied by the percentage of those with a history of child abuse and neglect, multiplied by the additional hours of investigative activity, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker. The number of incoming requests for underlying case information is multiplied by the cost per check. The number of incoming requests for underlying case information is multiplied by the number of hours to respond to the request, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.

Adoptions

The caseload is multiplied by the percentage of those living in another state, multiplied by the number of hours required to complete a registry check, multiplied by the hourly cost of an adoption worker. The number of registry checks is multiplied by the percentage of those with a history of child abuse and neglect, multiplied by the additional hours of investigative activity, multiplied by the hourly cost of an adoption worker. The number of incoming requests for underlying case information is multiplied by the cost per check. The number of incoming requests for underlying case information is multiplied by the number of hours to respond to the request, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.

CCL

The number of registry checks is multiplied by the percentage of those living in another state, multiplied by the number of hours required to complete a registry check, multiplied by the hourly cost of a licensing worker. The number of registry checks is multiplied by the percentage of those with a history of child abuse and neglect, multiplied by the additional hours of investigative activity, multiplied by the hourly cost of a licensing worker.

FUNDING:

For the CWS portion of this premise, after applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 66 percent for FY 2011-12, costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund (GF) and 30 percent county.

For the adoptions portion of this premise, the sharing ratio for FY 2010-11 is 42.09 percent federal and 57.91 percent nonfederal based on actual expenditure data from FY 2008-09. The sharing ratio for FY 2011-12 is 41.38 percent federal and 58.62 percent nonfederal based on FY 2009-10 actual expenditures for the Adoptions Basic Program.

For the CCL portion of this premise, the sharing ratio for FY 2010-11 is 36.30 percent federal Title IV-E and 63.70 percent GF based on actual expenditures in Calendar Year 2009. The sharing ratio for FY 2011-12 is 35.03 percent federal Title IV-E and 64.97 percent GF based on actual expenditures from Calendar Year 2010.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The change in the Budget year is due to a net decrease in caseload.

Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change to CWS, Adoptions and CCL is due to a net decrease in caseload. The three components also have increases in their non-federal sharing ratios.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

Item 151 - CWS	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$421	396
Federal	147	131
State	193	186
County	81	79
Reimbursements	0	0

Item 151 – Adoptions Program	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$109	\$105
Federal	46	44
State	63	61
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Item 151 - CCL	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$45	\$39
Federal	16	14
State	29	25
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Child Relationships (AB 408 Amended by AB 1412)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for social workers to perform additional activities on every initial and six month case plan and court report on children 10 years of age and older who are placed in group homes for more than six months to establish a special relationship with an important person in the child's life as stipulated by Assembly Bill (AB) 408 (Chapter 813, Statutes of 2003). Social workers must conduct investigations to identify these individuals, evaluate and assess relationships between foster children and other important people in their lives, excluding siblings, and take necessary actions to maintain these relationships. These identified persons are included in the child's Transitional Independent Living Plan (TILP).

Effective January 1, 2006, the provisions of AB 408 were amended as stipulated by AB 1412 (Chapter 640, Statutes of 2005) to include all children who are developmentally appropriate and who are in out-of-home placements. In addition, the social workers must insure that developmentally appropriate children are involved in the development of their case plan, help plan for permanent placement, and that children 12 years of age or older review their case plan, sign it, and receive a copy.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2004.

The provisions of AB 1412 implemented on July 1, 2006.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 349, 366-366.35, 391, 16001.9, and 16206 – 16501.1
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11, the estimate is being held to the Budget Act of 2010 Appropriation.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- For FY 2011-12, there will be approximately 5,987 new children 10 years of age and older and who have been in out-of-home placement for six months or longer. The social worker will spend at least four hours per case to assess the placement of the child and an additional one-half hour per case, for the six month case plan/court report.
- One out of every four relationships initially assessed will not be deemed in the child's best interest. In such cases, another relationship will be assessed, which will require four additional hours of social worker time.
- For FY 2011-12, there will be approximately 9,407 out-of-home placement cases for the six month case plan/court report for ongoing cases. The social worker will spend 15 minutes per case.
- Background checks will be performed on each initial and additional assessment case at a cost of \$87.00 per case.
- For FY 2011-12, there will be approximately 6,638 foster children age 16 and older in out-of-home placement who will complete a TILP.
- For FY 2011-12, there will be approximately 5,589 children age 8 to 11 years old who are developmentally appropriate who will participate in their case plan development.

Child Relationships (AB 408 Amended by AB 1412)

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- For FY 2011-12, there will be approximately 12,674 children age 12 years old and older who will review and sign their case plan.
- The social worker cost per hour is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

For FY 2010-11, the estimate is held at the Budget Act of 2010 Appropriation. For FY 2011-12, the estimate is calculated by multiplying the amount of time per activity by the frequency of the activity per year by the social worker rate and then by the number of cases. Background check costs are calculated by multiplying the cost per case by the caseload.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11, and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The change in the Budget Year is due to an increase in caseload.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in caseloads per activity, and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$5,559	\$5,299
Federal	1,946	1,802
State	2,529	2,448
County	1,084	1,049
Reimbursements	0	0

Personalized Transition Plan (P.L. 110-351)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise represents costs associated with the federal Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act [Public Law (P.L.) 110-351] that was signed into law on October 7, 2008. Section 202 of this federal bill mandates during the 90-day period immediately prior to the date in which the child will attain 18 years of age, or such greater age as the state may elect, a caseworker or other representatives of the child may provide the child with assistance and support in developing a Transitional Plan. This plan must include specific options on housing, health insurance, education, local opportunities for mentors, continuing support services, such as work force supports and employment services, and is as detailed as the child may elect.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2010.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act (P.L. 110-351) and Welfare and Institutions Code section 16501.1.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The Title IV-E Waiver counties' non-base is reflected in Item 153 Title IV-E Waiver.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11, 4,273 youth aged 17 and 18 will need a Transition Plan, based on July 2009 data.
- For FY 2011-12, 3,507 youth aged 17 and 18 will need a Transition Plan, based on July 2010 data.
- For FY 2011-12, 362 current 18 year olds are not accounted for under this premise but instead are included under the Extend Foster Care, Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment, Adoption Assistance Program Benefits (AB-12) premise and will not require a Transition Plan.
- It takes a social worker one hour to complete the Transition Plan with the foster child.
- The hourly social worker cost is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

The cost is derived by multiplying the caseload by the one hour it will take the social worker to complete the Transition Plan by the social worker hourly cost.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The change in the Budget Year is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to decreased caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

Personalized Transition Plan (P.L. 110-351)

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$310	\$255
Federal	109	87
State	141	118
County	60	50
Reimbursements	0	0

Resource Family Approval Pilot (AB 340)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs associated with Assembly Bill 340 (Chapter 464, Statutes of 2007) which requires the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), in consultation with stakeholders, and interested parties, to implement a three-year pilot program in up to five counties to establish a single, comprehensive, resource, family, pilot, approval process for foster care and adoption. This single process would replace the existing separate processes for licensing foster family homes, approving relatives and non-related extended family members (NREFM), and approving adoptive families.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on January 1, 2012.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16519 and 16519.5.
- The five pilot counties are: Fresno, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, and Yuba.
- The number of hours necessary to perform home approvals for relative/NREFM and licensing has been increased to 24 hours, which is equivalent to the level of an adoption approval.
- Duplicative processes for approvals and background checks are eliminated, thus creating savings.
- Placements are more stable, eliminating secondary placements for Foster Family Home (FFH) cases, thus creating savings.
- State administrative hearing reviews for licensing cases, denied and appealed, will be replaced by less-costly county grievance reviews. It is assumed that 20 percent of FFH cases that are denied will appeal, requiring eight hours of social worker (SW) time per grievance review.
- First year costs include one-time SW training and county start-up costs of \$356, 000. On-going annual training for new staff as a result of turnover is estimated at \$4,000.
- After the initial year of implementation, FFH cases will require three hours of SW time to perform annual reassessments.

Child Welfare Services (CWS)

- Based on actual data for FY 2009-10, the relative/NREFM caseload for the five pilot counties is 2,390.
 - Based on information from the California Welfare Directors Association, an average of 1.56 children is paced per home.
 - The hourly cost of a SW is \$72.60.
 - The number of hours to perform relative/NREFM home approvals is 15 hours.
 - Sixty percent of cases placed in FFHs experience at least one placement change within the first 12 months of placement. SWs typically spend 18 hours on activities associated with finding an alternate placement for these cases.
-

Resource Family Approval Pilot (AB 340)

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

Adoptions

- Based on actual data for FY 2009-10, the number of adoption cases going through the home approval process for the five pilot counties total 79.
- The hourly cost of an adoption worker is \$72.60.
- The number of hours to perform an adoptive home approval is 24 hours.
- The cost to conduct background checks is \$87 per check.
- Two persons per home will require a background check.

Community Care Licensing (CCL)

- Based on actual data for Calendar Year 2010, the number of CCL cases going through the home approval process for the five pilot counties total 159, of which 154 were approved and five were denied.
- The hourly cost of a licensing worker is \$70.68.
- The number of hours to perform a FFH home approval is 15.47 hours.

METHODOLOGY:

CWS

For relative/NREFM approval costs, calculate the difference between the hours per approval previously required, versus an adoption home approval. The difference is multiplied by the caseload and the hourly cost of a SW.

For FFH approval costs, multiply the caseload times the hours per approval, times the hourly cost of a SW.

Following the initial year of implementation, annual reassessment costs for the FFH cases are calculated by taking the number of approved new licenses, multiplied by the number of hours for each approval, multiplied by the hourly cost of a SW.

Grievance review costs for the FFH cases are calculated by taking 20 percent of the denied cases, multiplied by the number of hours per review, multiplied by the hourly cost of a SW.

Training and start-up costs are then added.

Adoptions

Savings are calculated for the elimination of approval and background check processes.

CCL

Savings are calculated for the elimination of approval processes.

Resource Family Approval Pilot (AB 340)

FUNDING:

CWS

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 66 percent for FY 2011-12, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund (GF) and 30 percent county.

Adoptions

Savings are shared based on actual sharing ratios in the Adoptions Program. The sharing ratio for FY 2011-12 is 44.03 percent federal and 55.97 percent GF.

CCL

Savings are shared based on actual FFH sharing ratios. The sharing ratio for FY 2011-12 is 36.23 percent federal and 63.77 percent GF.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The change in both the Current Year and Budget Year (BY) is due to a delay in implementation.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change in the BY is due to a half year implementation.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
CWS		
Total	\$0	\$933
Federal	0	323
State	0	427
County	0	183
Reimbursements	0	0

Resource Family Approval Pilot (AB 340)

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Adoptions		
Total	0	-\$75
Federal	0	-33
State	0	-42
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

	2010-11	2011-12
CCL		
Total	0	-\$86
Federal	0	-31
State	0	-55
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) Foster Care Application

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with implementing Assembly Bill (AB) 1331 (Chapter 465, Statutes of 2007) that requires counties to screen all foster youth age 16 ½ and older to determine if they are eligible for federal SSI benefits utilizing the best practice guidelines developed pursuant to AB 1633 (Chapter 641, Statutes of 2005). AB 1331 requires that an application be submitted for any child who is screened as being likely to be eligible for SSI benefits.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2008.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: AB 1331 (Chapter 465, Statutes of 2007).
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11, there are 3,938 children in foster care aged 16 ½ through 17 ½ that will require an SSI/SSP screening based on caseload data from December 2009.
- For FY 2011-12, there are 3,777 children in foster care aged 16 ½ through 17 ½ that will require an SSI/SSP screening based on caseload data from December 2010.
- Each screening will require 30 minutes of social worker time.
- Fifteen percent of those screened will have an SSI/SSP application submitted which will require eight hours of social worker time. Fifty percent of applications submitted will be initially denied and then appealed, requiring an additional six hours of social worker time.
- The average statewide social worker hourly cost is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

Costs are estimated by multiplying the caseload by the number of social worker hours, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) Foster Care Application

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$615	\$590
Federal	215	201
State	400	389
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Health Benefit Determination (AB 1512)

DESCRIPTION:

Assembly Bill 1512 (Chapter 467, Statutes of 2007) requires the county child welfare agency or probation department responsible for the child's placement to determine, in consultation with the foster parent, whether a foster child who is currently enrolled in a county organized health system (COHS) and is to be placed in an out-of-county placement should remain in the COHS. This bill requires that the determination be made one working day after the out-of-county placement begins. If the decision is to disenroll the child from the COHS, the placing county would also be required to request the disenrollment within two working days after the out-of-county placement begins.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2009.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 14093.09.
- There are currently fourteen counties that have adopted the COHS. They are: Marin, Mendocino, Merced, Monterey, Napa, Orange, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Sonoma, Ventura, and Yolo.
- Social workers will spend two hours on determination and disenrollment activities.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11, there will be 2,779 out-of-county placements (based on actual data from December 2009). For FY 2011-12, there will be 1,753 out-of-county placements (based on actual data from January 2011).
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

The cost is derived by multiplying the caseload by the two hours it will take the social worker to make the determination, by the social worker hourly cost, and by the caseload.

FUNDING:

For FY 2010 -11, after applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent, federally eligible costs are funded with 50 percent federal Title IV-E funds. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund (GF). For FY 2011-12, this program is eligible for federal Title XIX funding of 50 percent with a match of 50 percent GF.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change for the Current Year. The change in the Budget Year is due to a decrease in caseload and a change in funding source from Title IV-E to Title XIX.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in caseload and a change in funding source from Title IV-E to Title XIX.

Health Benefit Determination (AB 1512)

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$403	\$254
Federal	141	0
State	262	127
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	127

Foster Youth Identity Theft (AB 2985)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with requesting and evaluating a credit check and referring a child to an approved credit counseling organization, pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 2985 (Chapter 387, Statutes of 2006). AB 2985 requires a County Welfare Department (CWD) to request a credit check from a credit reporting agency for every foster child upon his/her 16th birthday. When a credit report contains negative information or evidence of identity theft, the CWD must refer the child to an approved credit counseling organization from a list developed by the California Department of Social Services, in consultation with the County Welfare Directors Association and other stakeholders.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

Implementation of this premise is suspended until Fiscal Year (FY) 2012-13.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10618.6.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The Title IV-E Waiver counties non-base is reflected in Item 153 Title IV-E Waiver.
- The estimate assumes every foster child upon his/her 16th birthday will receive credit checks from three credit bureaus.
- The time to process each credit check is one hour.
- Ten percent of the caseload will be referred to a credit counseling organization. The time to process each referral is one hour.
- The hourly cost of a social worker hour is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

The social worker cost is derived by multiplying the number of credit checks processed, and the number of referrals, by the social worker hourly cost.

FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 68 percent is applied, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to the suspension of the program until FY 2012-13.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

Foster Youth Identity Theft (AB 2985)

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Increase Funding for Caseworker Visits

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with Public Law (P.L.) 109-288, known as the Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006 which requires states to increase the percentage of foster children that are visited monthly to 90 percent by the year 2011 in order to continue receiving full Title IV-B funding. The P.L. 109-288 also required that the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) implement guidelines for what constitutes a quality visit with a foster child. In addition, a majority of those visits must occur in the child's home. States are required to submit a plan for approval by the federal Department of Health and Human Services that indicates their goals for improvement each Federal Fiscal Year (FFY). If states do not meet their goals each and every year they will be penalized accordingly. In order to capture information about the Probation Officer (PO) visits, this premise funds PO access to the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS).

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2009.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006 (P.L. 109-288). Welfare and Institutions Code section 16501.1.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- This estimate assumes that it will take a social worker 15 minutes to input the Foster Family Agency (FFA) monthly visit information in the CWS/CMS.
- This estimate assumes that it will take a social worker two hours monthly to visit each Foster Family Home (FFH) placement and record the information into CWS/CMS.
- This estimate assumes that it will take a social worker four hours monthly to visit out-of-county FFH placements and record the information in CWS/CMS.
- Beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12 this estimate assumes that 16.8 percent of the total missed visits will require a social worker to spend an additional 30 minutes of time per visit to improve the quality of the visit.
- The number of FFA visits where information will need to be entered into CWS/CMS is 21,136 for FY 2010-11 and 19,149 for FY 2011-12.
- For FY 2010-11 the number of missed visits is based on data from FFY 2009. For FY 2011-12, the missed visit data is updated by the percentage change in foster care caseload.
- The number of missed visits is 54,679 with 3,760 being out-of-county for FY 2010-11 and 44,213 with 7,380 being out-of-county for FY 2011-12.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.
- There are 175 POs who need access to CWS/CMS with a monthly fee for a token of \$27.00 each.

Increase Funding for Caseworker Visits

METHODOLOGY:

The caseload is multiplied by the number of hours, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker. The number of POs is multiplied by the monthly fee for a token, multiplied by twelve months.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs for the social worker visits are shared 70 percent General Fund (GF) and 30 percent county. Nonfederal costs for the tokens are 100 percent GF. A portion of the Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) funding is available for this new mandate (see the "PSSF premise for additional information).

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in the foster care caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in the foster care caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$6,922	\$5,493
Federal	2,423	772
State	3,160	3,316
County	1,339	1,405
Reimbursements	0	0

Chafee Federal National Youth in Transition Database

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with submitting demographic and outcome data on foster youth who receive Independent Living Program (ILP) services and those who age-out of foster care. All states are required to submit this data pursuant to the final regulations from the federal Administration for Children and Families (ACF) regarding implementation of the National Youth in Transition Database (NYTD). ACF has given states two and one half years to develop the methodology and capacity for collecting data on all ILP services and foster youth cohorts. ACF gave states until October 1, 2010, to fully implement the regulation requirements and begin collecting required data.

The principle data collection method for NYTD is a survey of current and former foster youth at ages 17, 19, and 21 years old. The surveys will be conducted through a contract with a university. Counties are required to inform 17 year olds in foster care of the purpose and scope of the survey, maintain periodic contact with former foster youth to meet federal response requirements, and secure consent forms from youth for participation in the follow-up survey. Surveys must be conducted continuously on a new cohort of 17 year olds every three years.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2009.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, Part 1356.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- The number of youth projected to take the survey is 3,945 based on actual caseload data of youth aged 17.
- In Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 social workers will spend 1 hour to inform the youth about the survey and update data in the database.
- In FY 2011-12 social workers will spend four hours tracking and maintaining contact with former foster youth.
- Contract costs for FY 2010-11 total \$332,044, and \$280,106 for FY 2011-12.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

The caseload is multiplied by the number of hours, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker. Contract costs are then added.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E. Nonfederal costs for social worker activities are shared 70 percent General Fund (GF) and 30 percent county. Nonfederal costs for contracts are 100 percent GF.

Chafee Federal National Youth in Transition Database

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The change in the Current Year is due to an increase in social worker time and contract costs, offset by a decrease in caseload. The change in the Budget Year is due to an increase in contract costs, offset by a decrease in caseload and the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase is due to implementing the follow-up activities which require more time and an increase in contract costs.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$618	\$1,426
Federal	216	485
State	346	714
County	56	227
Reimbursements	0	0

Registered Sex Offender Check

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs to minimize the risk of predictable and preventable harm to vulnerable children in out-of-home care by detecting the presence/residence of a Registered Sex Offender (RSO) in prospective and approved licensed facilities and prospective and approved relative/Nonrelative Extended Family Member (NREFM) homes.

On an annual basis the California Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division (CCLD) will compare transmitted Department of Justice (DOJ) sex offender files against the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS) placement information for county-licensed Foster Family Homes (FFH), Family Child Care Homes (FCCH), and county-approved relative and NREFM homes. County welfare departments will then be responsible for investigating any address matches, with the exception of relatives and NREFM homes for the 20 small counties which will be investigated by CCLD.

County welfare departments will also check all prospective licensure applicants and relative/NREFM homes against the Megan's Law Public Website and investigate all address matches. When a match resulting from the annual or prospective check is verified, county welfare departments will take appropriate action, which may include licensure and placement denial, removal of children and finding a new placement, and grievance reviews for relatives/NREFMs.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2009.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: The annual Budget Act.

Child Welfare Services (CWS)

Prospective Relative/NREFM Check

- The caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 is 19,294 based on actual relative and NREFM placement data for FY 2008-09.
- The caseload for FY 2011-12 is 18,179 based on actual relative and NREFM placement data for FY 2009-10.
- The time required to check each home against the Megan's Law Public Website is estimated at 0.33 hours (20 minutes).
- The match rate is 0.10 percent based on the Bureau of State Audits May 2008 report.
- An investigation will be performed on each match and will require an estimated 6.75 hours.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.

Annual Check

- For FY 2010-11, the relative placement caseload, excluding the 20 small counties, is 22,701 based on placement data for December 2009. The relative placement caseload for the 20 small counties is 473 cases.
- For FY 2011-12, the relative placement caseload, excluding the 20 small counties, is 21,655 based on placement data for December 2010. The relative placement caseload for the 20 small counties is 530 cases.

Registered Sex Offender Check

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

- Based on information from the California Welfare Directors' Association, it is assumed that an average of 1.56 children are placed per home.
- The match rate is 0.10 percent based on the Bureau of State Audits May 2008 report.
- An investigation will require an estimated 6.75 hours for each match, excluding the 20 small counties.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.

Grievance Review

- The total number of relative/NREFM homes that are disapproved is estimated at 33 based on the number of all matches for prospective and annual checks each year.
- It is assumed that 20 percent of those disapproved homes will request a review.
- It is assumed that it will take an average of eight hours to review each case.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.

Removal and Finding New Placement

- It is assumed that each address match will be verified and will result in license revocation and home disapproval.
- It is estimated that there are approximately 1.56 children placed per relative home, and approximately 14 relative/NREFM homes disapproved, resulting in approximately 22 children being removed.
- It is estimated that there are approximately 2.5 children placed per FFH, and approximately eight licenses revoked each year, resulting in 20 children being removed. It is assumed that the removal and finding new placement will take an average of 18 hours per removal.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.

Community Care Licensing (CCL)

Annual Check

- The FFH caseload for FY 2010-11 is 7,269 and for FY 2011-12 it is 7,156. The FCCH caseload for FY 2010-11 is 3,678 and for FY 2011-12 it is 3,843.
- The match rate is 0.10 percent.
- It is assumed that it will take an FFH licensing worker 30.90 hours and an FCCH license worker 33 hours to investigate each address match.
- It is assumed that 41 percent of the matches will require administrative action.
- It is assumed that it will take an FFH and FCCH licensing worker 31 hours for each administrative action.
- The hourly cost of an FFH licensing worker is \$70.68.
- The hourly cost of an FCCH licensing worker is \$66.30.

Registered Sex Offender Check

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED):

Application Check

- For FY 2010-11, there are 2,676 FFH and 367 FCCH applications received in FY 2008-09. For FY 2011-12, there are 2,156 FFH and 242 FCCH applications received in FY 2009-10.
- The match rate is 0.10 percent based on the Bureau of State Audits May 2008 report.
- It is assumed that it will take an FFH licensing worker 30.90 hours and an FCCH licensing worker 33 hours to investigate each address match.
- It is assumed that 41 percent of the matches will require administrative action.
- It is assumed that it will take an FFH and FCCH licensing worker 31 hours for each administrative action.
- It is assumed that it will take a licensing worker 20 minutes to check an address against the Megan's Law Public website.
- The hourly cost of an FFH licensing worker is \$70.68.
- The hourly cost of an FCCH licensing worker is \$66.30.

METHODOLOGY:

CWS

For relative and NREFM prospective checks, the caseload is multiplied by the time required for each check, plus the number of matches multiplied by the total hours per investigations, all multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.

For annual checks, the number of homes, excluding the 20 small counties, is multiplied by the match rate, the total hours per investigation, and the hourly cost of a social worker.

For grievance reviews, total matches for all counties are multiplied by the percent requesting review, the number of hours per review, and the hourly cost of a social worker.

For removal and new placement activities, the total number of children removed is multiplied by the hours required to remove the child and find a new placement and the hourly cost of a social worker.

CCL

For FFH/FCCH applications, the caseload is multiplied by the match rate, multiplied by the total hours required per investigation plus the number of administrative actions, multiplied by the number of hours per action, plus the caseload multiplied by the time it will take to check an address against the Megan's Law Public website and all multiplied by the hourly cost of an FFH/FCCH licensing worker.

For FFH/FCCH annual checks, the caseload is multiplied by the match rate, multiplied by the total hours required per investigation, plus the number of administrative actions, multiplied by the number of hours per action, and all multiplied by the hourly cost of an FFH/FCCH licensing worker.

FUNDING:

CWS - After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 66 percent for FY 2011-12, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund (GF).

Registered Sex Offender Check

FUNDING (CONTINUED):

CCL – The sharing ratio for FFH is 35.03 percent federal Title IV-E and 64.97 percent GF based on actual expenditures from calendar year 2010. The FCCH costs are 100 percent GF.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The change in the Budget Year is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to decreased caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(In 000's)

TOTAL	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$663	\$619
Federal	225	200
State	438	419
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0
CWS	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$544	\$514
Federal	190	170
State	354	344
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0
CCL	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$119	\$105
Federal	35	30
State	84	75
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Increase Family Case Planning Meetings to Improve Child Welfare Outcomes

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide counties with the funding necessary to increase efforts to engage families and youth in case planning to meet the requirements of the state's federal Program Improvement Plan. This premise will fund additional social worker positions throughout California to increase the number of facilitated case planning meetings that include parents, extended family members, community service providers and others in order to strengthen reunifications and decrease foster care reentries.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2009.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The annual Budget Act.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11, the caseload is projected at 11,117 based on the number of youths that exited foster care to reunification during FY 2008-09.
- For FY 2011-12, the caseload is projected at 10,972 based on the number of youths that exited foster care to reunification during FY 2009-10.
- Each case will receive three case planning meetings each year.
- Case planning meetings require an average of 2.7 hours.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.
- FY 2010-11 includes a General Fund (GF) reduction of \$1 million, of which \$629,000 is for non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. The remaining amount is reflected under Item 153.
- FY 2011-12 includes the continued GF reduction of \$1 million, of which \$638,000 is for non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. The remaining amount is reflected under Item 153.

METHODOLOGY:

The caseload is multiplied by the number of meetings per year, the number of social worker hours, and the hourly cost of a social worker.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The change in the Budget Year is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

Increase Family Case Planning Meetings to Improve Child Welfare Outcomes

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in caseload.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$5,155	\$5,072
Federal	1,804	1,725
State	2,346	2,343
County	1,005	1,004
Reimbursements	0	0

Notification of Relatives (P.L. 110-351)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to notify relatives when a child has been removed from parental custody as mandated by the federal Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act [Public Law (P.L.) 110-351] which was signed into law on October 7, 2008. Section 103 of this federal bill requires that counties perform due diligence to identify and provide notice to all adult relatives within 30 days of removal, with the exception of potentially abusive relatives. Relatives will be notified that the child has been or is being removed from parental care, the options they have under federal, state, and local laws and the requirements to become a foster family home.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2010.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act (P.L. 110-351).
- Assembly Bill 938 (Chapter 261, Statutes of 2009) amended Welfare and Institutions Code sections 309 and 628 to ensure that state law included the new federal requirements.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- An average of two hours of social worker time is required per case to identify and provide a notice to all adult relatives.
- The annual caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 is projected at 19,971 based on FY 2008-09 new out-of-home placements. The annual caseload for FY 2011-12 is projected at 18,734 based on new out-of-home placements for FY 2009-10.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

The caseload is multiplied by the number of social worker hours per case, and the hourly cost of a social worker.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in caseload and a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

Notification of Relatives (P.L. 110-351)

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$2,900	\$2,720
Federal	1,015	925
State	1,320	1,257
County	565	538
Reimbursements	0	0

Increase Relative Search and Engagement

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs to provide counties with resources necessary to increase family finding and engagement efforts statewide in compliance with the state's federal Program Improvement Plan. Relative placements are more stable than non-relative placements, reduce foster care reentry rates, and reduce the isolation and negative consequences on youth who exit the foster care system. The additional resources would facilitate the location of relatives as a placement option for children who are not currently placed with relatives upon entry into foster care, and would establish strong familial connections for youth in non-relative placements approaching emancipation.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2009.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The annual Budget Act.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11, there are 12,595 new entries into foster care that are not placed with relatives, based on data for FY 2008-09, and there are 3,328 youths age 16 and above not currently placed with relatives that have been in foster care for at least 18 months based on data from Calendar Year 2009.
- For FY 2011-12, there are 11,962 new entries into foster care not placed with relatives, based on data for FY 2009-10, and there are 3,260 youths age 16 and above not currently placed with relatives that have been in foster care for at least 18 months based on data from Calendar Year 2010.
- For new entries into foster care not placed with relatives, an average of eight hours of social worker time per case will be required to search for and engage relatives.
- For youths age 16 and above not currently placed with relatives that have been in foster care for at least 18 months, an average of 27.5 hours of social worker time per case will be required to search for and engage relatives.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.
- FY 2010-11 includes a General Fund (GF) reduction of \$1.5 million, of which \$966,000 is for non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. The remaining amount is reflected in Item 153.
- FY 2011-12 includes a GF reduction of \$1.5 million, of which \$928,000 is for non-Title IV-E Waiver counties. The remaining amount is reflected in Item 153.

METHODOLOGY:

The caseload is multiplied by the respective number of social worker hours and the hourly cost of a social worker.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 70 percent for FY 2010-11 and 68 percent for FY 2011-12, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

Increase Relative Search and Engagement

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The change in the Budget Year is due to an increase in caseload.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to an increase in caseload.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$11,837	\$11,448
Federal	4,143	3,892
State	5,386	5,289
County	2,308	2,267
Reimbursements	0	0

Child Welfare Services Reduction

DESCRIPTION:

Child Welfare Services (CWS) provides case management and services for abused and neglected children and their families. The program also provides for training and technical assistance for administrators and staff. This proposal is a reduction to the total General Fund (GF) for CWS. Due to lower revenue projections, budget reductions are needed to balance the Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10, FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 budgets.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2009.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The amount of the GF reduction for the non-Title IV-E Waiver counties is \$60,881,000.
- The amount of the GF reduction for the Title IV-E Waiver counties is \$19,075,000.

METHODOLOGY:

The GF reduction for FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 is held to the Budget Act 2010 Appropriation.

FUNDING:

The reduction is 100 percent GF.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	-\$79,956	-\$79,956
Federal	0	0
State	-79,956	-79,956
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Child Welfare Services Reduction

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

Item 151	2010-11	2011-12
Total	-\$60,881	-\$60,881
Federal	0	0
State	-60,881	-60,881
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0
Item 153	2010-11	2011-12
Total	-\$19,075	-\$19,075
Federal	0	0
State	-19,075	-19,075
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Probation Access to CWS/CMS

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the ongoing costs of training probation staff regarding accessing the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS). Probation staff require this access in order to fulfill their case management responsibilities related to entering data and ensuring that the correct fields are populated for state collection and reporting to the federal Administration for Children and Families.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on July 1, 2011.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Annual training costs will total \$800,000.

METHODOLOGY:

Costs are added for ongoing annual training.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 66 percent, federally eligible costs are shared 75 percent Title IV-E and 25 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The Budget Year (BY) change is due to existing resources now being drawn upon to cover prior budgeted costs.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise will implement in the BY.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$0	\$800
Federal	0	396
State	0	404
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Foster Care Placement & Proximity to School of Origin

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs for social workers to enter school transfer information and educational progress into a child's health and education passport (or comparable format) upon their placement into foster care. Senate Bill 1353 (Chapter 557, Statutes of 2010) required that efforts be made to select a school setting that is in close proximity to a child's home, promotes educational stability by considering its location in or near the child's school of origin or attendance area, and provides an opportunity to delay any necessary school transfers to the summer or normal matriculation schedule. This new information will allow social workers another tool to use in an effort to promote educational stability.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on July 1, 2011.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16001.9, 16010, and 16501.1.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the 56 non-Title IV-E Waiver counties.
- An average of 15 minutes of social worker time is required per case to enter school transfer information into a child's health and education passport.
- The caseload is projected to be 8,592 based on new entries to foster care, ages 6 to 18 during Calendar Year 2010.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

The caseload is multiplied by the social worker time per case, and the hourly cost of a social worker.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 68 percent, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The change in the Budget Year is due to updated caseload data.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This is a new premise.

Foster Care Placement & Proximity to School of Origin

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$0	\$156
Federal	0	53
State	0	72
County	0	31
Reimbursements	0	0

Sibling Placement (AB 743)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with Sibling Placement Assembly Bill (AB) 743 (Chapter 560, Statutes of 2010) and additional mandatory provisions of the Fostering Connections and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-351) regarding the placement of siblings who are removed from their home, by requiring that a diligent effort be made to place siblings together, or if siblings are not placed together, to provide for ongoing and frequent interaction between the siblings, unless doing either of those would be contrary to any of the siblings' safety or well-being. This premise also requires the placing agency to notify the attorney's of the child and the child's siblings at least ten days in advance if a planned change in placement would separate siblings who are currently placed together, or seven days notice if the request for a change in placement comes from a provider which is required to give seven days notice to the placing agency.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on July 1, 2011.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16010.6.
- This estimate reflects costs for only the non-Title IV-E Wavier counties.
- The total monthly caseload for children in out of home placements for Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12 is 38,851.
- It is assumed 2.6 percent of total statewide out of home placement notices are required to be sent to attorneys representing siblings.
- It is assumed that two hours of social workers time is required to process this notice, at a cost of \$72.60 per hour.

METHODOLOGY:

The total caseload is multiplied by 2.6 percent of total out of home placements, multiplied by two hours of social worker time required and multiplied by social worker cost of \$72.60 per hour.

FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 68 percent is applied, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. The nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent General Fund and 30 percent county.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change for the Current Year. The change in Budget Year is due to a decrease in caseload and foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise will implement on July 1, 2011.

Sibling Placement (AB 743)

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$0	\$149
Federal	0	51
State	0	69
County	0	29
Reimbursements	0	0

Court Cases

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for attorney fees and settlement costs resulting from lawsuits pertaining to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), Budget Item 151 – Social Service Programs, specifically, Child Welfare Services, Special Programs, and Community Care Licensing.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The attorney fees and settlement costs for these court cases are anticipated to be paid in Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and FY 2011-12.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The estimate for attorney fees and settlement costs is based, in part, on actual payments for specific cases in the Current Year (CY), and a projection of costs that are anticipated to be paid in the CY and the Budget Year (BY).

FUNDING:

The legal fees and settlement costs are funded 100 percent General Fund.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The increase in the CY is based on updated actual cost information. The decrease in the BY is based on updated projection of costs that are anticipated to be paid.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase is based on updated actual cost information.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$106	\$115
Federal	0	0
State	106	115
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Adoptions Program – Basic Costs

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs associated with agency (relinquishment) adoptions for 30 counties and independent adoptions for three of those 30 counties. Although only 28 counties provide adoptive services, these costs include funding for independent adoptions and services in two adjacent counties. Relinquishment and agency adoption include:

1. Agency (Relinquishment) Adoptions - Placements through a licensed adoption agency in which a child to be adopted has been relinquished by his or her legal parents or in which, due to abuse or neglect, parental rights have been terminated by court action.
2. Independent Adoptions - Placements in which the parents place a child directly with an adopting family or persons of their choice.

The 1996 Adoptions Initiative (Assembly Bill 1524, Chapter 1083, Statutes of 1996) was introduced to maximize adoption opportunities for children in public foster care and reduce the foster care population. Counties were funded based on performance agreements that increased the number of adoption social workers in an effort to double the number of statewide adoptive placements. As a result of the Adoptions Initiative, the annual number of foster children who were placed in an adoptive home increased from 3,000 to over 7,200.

Previously, this premise was separated from the Adoptions Initiative premise in order to illustrate the fiscal impact of the Initiative. However, since achieving the goal of doubling the number of statewide adoptions, this premise now combines the Adoptions Initiative with the Adoption Program basic costs to fund the program with 560.55 full-time equivalents (FTEs).

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16100 through 16106.
- The counties are provided funding for 560.55 FTEs in each Fiscal Year (FY).
- The statewide average annual unit cost of an adoption worker is held at \$128,564 for each FY.
- Additional federal spending authority in the amount of \$8,794,357 for FY 2010-11, and \$6,610,887 for FY 2011-12 is included based on actual expenditure.
- The Improving Adoptions Outcomes Appropriation of \$11,206,375 [\$6,544,054 General Fund (GF)] has been rolled into the Adoptions Basic Costs.
- For FY 2011-12, the savings associated with the Independent Adoptions fee increase will not benefit this premise.

METHODOLOGY:

- Estimates are individually calculated for each county that performs its own adoptive services by multiplying the number of FTEs by the county's annual adoption worker unit cost.
- Additional federal funds are included to bring the federal spending authority up to a level based on actual historical expenditure data.

Adoptions Program – Basic Costs

FUNDING:

The sharing ratio for FY 2010-11 is 42.09 percent federal and 57.91 percent nonfederal based on actual expenditure data from FY 2008-09. The sharing ratio for FY 2011-12 is 41.38 percent federal and 58.62 percent nonfederal based on actual expenditure data from FY 2009-10. The nonfederal share is 100 percent GF. Additional federal funding is included in the amount of \$8,794,357 for FY 2010-11 and \$6,610,887 for FY 2011-12 to provide sufficient federal spending authority to a level based on expenditures.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is based on updated expenditures.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease is due to a decrease in the amount of additional federal funds as tied to federal expenditures, and an erosion of savings due to no benefit being received in FY 2011-12 from the Independent Adoptions fee increase.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$91,970	\$89,884
Federal	43,901	41,256
State	48,069	48,628
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Private Agency Adoption Reimbursement Payments

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of providing private agency adoption reimbursement payments (PAARP) to private adoption agencies for expenditures associated with adoptive placements of special needs children. Assembly Bill (AB) 1524 (Chapter 1083, Statutes of 1996) established a \$3,500 compensatory limit per placement of special needs children. AB 1225 (Chapter 905, Statutes of 1999) increased the compensatory limit per placement to \$5,000 per adoptive placement of a special needs child. Senate Bill (SB) 84 (Chapter 177, Statutes of 2007) increased the compensatory limit per placement to \$10,000 per placement of a special need child for which the adoptive home study approval occurred on or after July 1, 2007.

Once the child is placed, a claim is submitted to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) for an individual child by the private adoption agency. CDSS program staff review the claim, verify federal eligibility, and forward the claim(s) to the Office of the State Controller for direct issuance of a reimbursement payment to the private adoption agency. Fiscal control is maintained by CDSS program staff.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1992.

The AB 1225 reimbursement payment increase went into effect on July 1, 1999.

The SB 84 reimbursement payment increase went into effect on February 1, 2008, for all qualifying placements.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16120 through 16122.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11, based on actual caseload and expenditure data, the PAARP caseload is projected at 4,031, with a cost of \$7,322 per adoptive placement. For FY 2011-12 the PAARP caseload is projected at 3,309, with a cost of \$7,837 per adoptive placement.

METHODOLOGY:

The projected number of private agency adoptive placements is multiplied by the reimbursement cost per placement.

FUNDING:

Costs are shared at 44 percent federal funds and 56 percent General Fund based on actual expenditures.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in caseload based on expenditures.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change reflects a decreased in the projected caseload, offset by an increase in the cost per case.

Private Agency Adoption Reimbursement Payments

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$29,517	\$25,934
Federal	12,569	11,480
State	16,948	14,454
County	0	0
Reimbursement	0	0

Foster and Adoptive Home Recruitment

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with using the services of local community organizations to increase the pool of minority adoptive families in an effort to place more minority children. The program is administered via contracts between the California Department of Social Services and private providers; counties are not directly involved.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1982.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Federal Multiethnic Placement Act.
- The Foster and Adoptive Home Recruitment program will fund three contracts with private providers.

METHODOLOGY:

- The estimate is based on anticipated and actual executed contracts.
- The foster care federal discount rate is 70 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and 66 percent for FY 2011-12.

FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate, federally eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in Current Year. The Budget Year change is based on the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to an increase in contract costs, offset by a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$443	\$483
Federal	155	159
State	288	324
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

County Counsel Costs

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of the parental rights termination proceedings for those counties that do not provide their own adoption services. For these counties, Senate Bill 243 (Chapter 1485, Statutes of 1987) transferred the function of terminating parental rights for court dependents from the state Attorney General's Office to the county counsels, effective January 1, 1990.

Cost elements of the parental rights termination function are primarily attorney and paralegal costs; however, they also include minor costs such as publication of notices, process server fees, court reporter fees, sheriff fees, and expert witness fees.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1990.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institution Code sections 16100 through 16106.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11, the average cost per case is \$10,076 based on actual data from FY 2008-09.
- For FY 2011-12, the average cost per case is \$6,860 based on actual data from calendar year 2010.
- For those counties that report expenditures, the projected number of children freed for adoption by county counsels is 209 for FY 2010-11 and 295 for FY 2011-12.

METHODOLOGY:

The average cost per case was derived by dividing the expenditures by the number of children freed during that same period. The average cost per case was then multiplied by the projected number of children to be legally freed for adoption.

FUNDING:

The state and federal share is based on the actual sharing ratios for FY 2009-10 expenditures.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to an increase in the cost per case.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in the cost per case, offset by an increase in caseload.

County Counsel Costs

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$2,106	\$2,024
Federal	1,052	1,012
State	1,054	1,012
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Nonrecurring Adoption Expenses

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs to reimburse families for nonrecurring adoption expenses associated with adopting special needs children. These costs may include, but are not limited to, legal fees, court filing fees, special medical examinations, and psychological evaluations. Only families adopting special needs children are eligible for reimbursement of these one-time costs.

The California maximum reimbursement amount is \$400 with a 50 percent federal sharing ratio. Assembly Bill 2129 (Chapter 1089, Statutes of 1993) made this cap permanent.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1990.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16120.1.
- The caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 is approximately 6,495 each year.
- The maximum reimbursement that can be applied to each case is \$400.
- Approximately 68 percent of all adopted children can be classified as special needs children.
- Based on actual caseload and expenditure data, an average of 39.39 percent will submit claims in FY 2010-11 and 40.35 percent will submit claims in FY 2011-12.

METHODOLOGY:

The estimate was developed by multiplying the projected number of adoptions by the percentage that would qualify as special needs cases. This number was then multiplied by the average percentage of submitted claims, and then by the maximum reimbursement amount.

FUNDING:

The funding for these reimbursements is 50 percent federal and 50 percent General Fund. There is no county share.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in the Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in caseload.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in caseload.

Nonrecurring Adoption Expenses

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$726	\$712
Federal	363	356
State	363	356
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Specialized Training for Adoptive Parents (STAP)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with implementing Assembly Bill (AB) 2198 (Chapter 1014, Statutes of 1998) which provides special training and services to facilitate the adoption of children who are HIV positive or who have a condition of symptoms resulting from substance abuse by the mother. Specifically, this funding will provide recruitment, special training, and respite care to families adopting court dependent children who are either HIV positive or assessed as being prenatally exposed to alcohol or a controlled substance. This program is similar to the Child Welfare Services Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program (Options for Recovery) authorized by AB 67 (Chapter 606, Statutes of 1997).

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1998.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16135 through 16135.30.
- This program is available to any county requesting participation pursuant to established procedures and to the extent funds are available. There are currently seven counties (El Dorado, Monterey, Riverside, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz, and Shasta) that are participating in this program.
- The foster care federal discount rate is 70 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and 66 percent for FY 2011-12.
- Of the \$1 million General Fund (GF) appropriation established through AB 2198, respite is set at \$605,000, training at \$105,900, and recruitment at \$289,100.

METHODOLOGY:

The estimate for this program was developed by calculating the GF costs for each of the three separate components (respite care, training, and recruitment), and holding to these GF values as shares of the \$1 million GF appropriation established through AB 2198. Other shares and the total funding change as a result of fluctuations in the foster care federal discount rate.

FUNDING:

Upon developing this premise, a \$1 million GF appropriation was established against which all other shares are calculated and updated.

Recruitment Activities - After applying the foster care federal discount rate, federally eligible recruitment activities are funded with 50 percent federal Title IV-E funds and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

Training - After applying the foster care federal discount rate, federally eligible training costs are funded with 75 percent federal Title IV-E funds and 25 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

Respite Care - Respite care is funded with 70 percent GF and 30 percent county funds.

Specialized Training for Adoptive Parents (STAP)

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change in Current Year. The Budget Year change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to a decrease in the foster care federal discount rate.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,819	\$1,781
Federal	390	352
State	1,000	1,000
County	429	429
Reimbursements	0	0

Nonresident Petitions for Adoption (AB 746)

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with conducting home studies for non-California residents who file a petition for either an agency or independent adoption in the county where the child resides. Assembly Bill (AB) 746 (Chapter 1112, Statutes of 2002) requires a review to be conducted and an endorsed home study report to be completed by either the California Department of Social Services or a California licensed adoption agency. This home study report would need approval in the nonresident petitioner's state.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2003.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Family Code sections 8714 through 8715, 8802, and 8807.
- AB 746 would result in an increase of 33 more out-of-state adoptions.
- Each new case would require, on average, 2.5 visits per year.
- It would take 16 hours, including travel, to conduct each visit.
- Travel costs are estimated to be \$624 (including per diem) per visit.
- The average hourly cost for a social worker is \$72.60.

METHODOLOGY:

The estimate was developed by first multiplying the number of new cases by the average number of visits required (33 new cases x 2.5 visits per case = 82.5 total visits). The average cost of the social worker (\$72.60 per hour x 16 hours per visit = \$1,162) was added to the travel costs (\$1,162 cost of social worker + \$624 travel costs = \$1,786). This total cost was then multiplied by the number of total visits (82.5 total visits x \$1,786 cost per visit = \$147,312).

FUNDING:

For Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11, the federal share of costs is 42.09 percent and the General Fund (GF) share is 57.91 percent based on FY 2008-09 actual expenditures for the Adoptions Basic program. For FY 2011-12, the federal share of costs is 41.38 percent and the GF share is 58.62 percent based on FY 2009-10 actual expenditures for the Adoptions Basic program.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

There is no change.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to an increase in the GF share of costs.

Nonresident Petitions for Adoption (AB 746)

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11 County Admin.	2011-12 County Admin.
Total	\$147	\$147
Federal	62	61
State	85	86
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

County Third Party Contracts

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment (CAPIT) program. Assembly Bill 1733 (Chapter 1398, Statutes of 1982) established CAPIT to fund prevention and intervention services for children at risk of abuse and/or neglect. Contracts with community-based public and private agencies utilize CAPIT funds to provide services to high-risk children and their families, as well as training and technical assistance to funded agencies. The program includes a local assistance contract component of approximately \$1 million which funds innovative, child-centered approaches for the prevention of child abuse and neglect.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 18960 through 18965.
- These funds are used to fulfill federal Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention grant matching and leveraging requirements.

METHODOLOGY:

Total funding is divided among county allocations, innovative services, and training and technical assistance/state support as follows:

- County Allocations: Counties are allocated a total of \$12,356,000 through Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12. Small counties receive a preset minimum funding level; the remaining distribution uses a formula that considers a county's child population (under age 18), children receiving public assistance, and child abuse reports.
- Innovative Services Contracts: There is \$1,039,000 appropriated for innovative services contracts through FY 2011-12. A competitive bid process determines the grantees of innovative services contracts.
- Training and Technical Assistance (T&TA)/State Support: There is \$306,200 to ensure that the programs effectively serve high-risk children and their families, provide for regional training on various child abuse issues and periodic statewide training institutes, and provide state support for the program. Of the \$306,200, \$200,000 is appropriated for a statewide nonprofit consortium. The T&TA/State Support amount is not included in the local assistance budget.

FUNDING:

The CAPIT funding is 100 percent General Fund.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The decrease in the Current Year is due to updated contract costs. There is no change in the Budget Year.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The change is due to updated contract costs.

County Third Party Contracts

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2010-11	2011-12
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$13,364	\$13,395
Federal	0	0
State	13,364	13,395
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

County Services Block Grant – Basic Costs

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the County Services Block Grant (CSBG) funding provided to the counties. The CSBG provides funds for Adult Protective Services (APS) and APS administrative costs. The CSBG may also be used to fund related optional services and activities to the extent funds are available.

Non-Medical Out-of-Home Care (NMOHC) administrative costs related to the Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment program have also been included in this premise since Fiscal Year (FY) 2000-01. These NMOHC costs were previously reflected in the “Small Programs (non-CalWORKs) Block Grant” premise.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 13004 through 13007.
- The General Fund (GF) is block granted at \$10.5 million.
- The county match (\$10.9 million) reflects the FY 1996-97 CSBG county expenditure level. Senate Bill 2199 (Chapter 946, Statutes of 1998) required the counties to maintain their FY 1996-97 APS expenditure level for CSBG purposes.
- The Title XIX reimbursement rate is assumed to be 41.98 percent, based on the actual federal reimbursement percentage claimed on county administrative expense claims for the past four quarters.

METHODOLOGY:

- In the Current Year (CY), estimated costs are computed by adding the GF block grant, the county match, the Title XIX reimbursements and the NMOHC costs ($\$10,500,000 + \$10,936,000 + \$25,020,951 + \$388,622 = \$46,845,573$).
- In the Budget Year (BY), the estimated costs are computed by adding the GF block grant, the county match, the Title XIX reimbursements and the NMOHC costs ($\$10,500,000 + \$10,936,000 + \$25,020,951 + \$324,662 = \$46,781,613$).

FUNDING:

- The GF for CSBG is block granted at \$10.5 million with county participation at the maintenance of effort level.
- The NMOHC is funded with 100 percent GF.
- The Title XIX reimbursements are as follows:
 - Health-related activities performed by skilled professional medical personnel are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 75 percent.
 - Health-related activities performed by non-skilled professional medical personnel are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 50 percent.

County Services Block Grant – Basic Costs

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The CY and the BY increase reflects the updated Title XIX expenditures.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY decrease reflects updated NMOHC costs.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$46,846	\$46,782
Federal	0	0
State	10,889	10,825
County	10,936	10,936
Reimbursements	25,021	25,021

Adult Protective Services

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the funds available over and above the funds provided in the County Services Block Grant (CSBG) for the provision of Adult Protective Services (APS). Senate Bill (SB) 2199 (Chapter 946, Statutes of 1998) established a statewide mandated APS program and provided these additional funds for expanded APS activities. The county share of APS expenditures are held at the Fiscal Year (FY) 1996-97 county match level for the CSBG. The APS program has been funded in whole or in part under CSBG since the Budget Act of 1984. The APS program, administered by the county welfare departments, provides assistance to elderly and dependent adults who are functionally impaired, unable to meet their own needs, and who are victims of abuse, neglect, or exploitation.

The APS program, as defined in SB 2199, requires the counties to respond to reports of elder and dependent adult abuse on a 24-hour emergency response basis. Among the services required by SB 2199 are investigations, needs assessments, and case management services. The SB 2199 also provides for necessary tangible resources such as food, emergency shelter care, in-home protection, transportation, and the use of multidisciplinary teams.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

- This premise implemented on July 1, 1997.
- The enhanced APS program became effective May 1, 1999.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Elder Abuse and Dependent Adult Civil Protection Act, commencing Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 15600.
- This program received a \$20 million General Fund (GF) augmentation in the Budget Act of 1998 to provide counties with additional resources needed to implement the statewide mandated APS program. An additional \$25.3 million GF augmentation was provided in the 1999 Budget Act.
- Effective FY 1998-99, counties are assumed to have no share of the APS costs of this premise beyond their share in APS under the CSBG. The SB 2199 held county costs to the FY 1996-97 CSBG expenditure level.
- The Financial Elder Abuse Reporting Act of 2005, resulting from SB 1018 (Chapter 140, Statutes of 2005) and which added W&IC section 15630.1, established all officers and employees of financial institutions as "mandated reporters of suspected financial abuse of an elder or dependent adult." The mandated reporter shall report the known or suspected financial abuse as soon as possible. County APS activities to implement SB 1018, which are offered statewide, include training, educational materials, and technical assistance in APS reporting. Training for financial institutions by county APS staff is ongoing. This section shall remain in effect until January 1, 2013, unless extended or repealed.

METHODOLOGY:

The GF estimated expenditures are held at the FY 2002-03 levels and the federal Title XIX reimbursement is based on actual expenditures for the most recent four quarters.

Adult Protective Services

FUNDING:

- The program is funded with GF and Title XIX reimbursements.
- The Title XIX reimbursements are as follows:
 - Health-related activities performed by skilled professional medical personnel are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 75 percent.
 - Health-related activities performed by non-skilled professional medical personnel are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 50 percent.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The Current Year (CY) and the Budget Year (BY) increases reflect the updated Title XIX expenditures.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY increase reflects a change in the updated Title XIX expenditures.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$103,166	\$103,166
Federal	0	0
State	50,179	50,179
County	0	0
Reimbursements	52,987	52,987

Reduce Adult Protective Services Program by Ten Percent

DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects saving resulting from reducing the funds available for the provision of Adult Protective Services (APS) by ten percent effective July 1, 2008. This premise was necessitated by budget balancing reductions.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2008.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- This premise reflects reductions in APS and County Services Block Grant (CSBG) Basic funding.
- The county match (\$10.9 million) required by Senate Bill 2199 (Chapter 946, Statutes of 1998) is not impacted.

METHODOLOGY:

The savings reflect ten percent of the projected expenditures for APS and CSBG for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and FY 2011-12.

FUNDING:

- The program is funded with General Fund and Title XIX reimbursements.
- The Title XIX reimbursements are as follows:
 - Health-related activities performed by skilled professional medical personnel are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 75 percent.
 - Health-related activities performed by non-skilled professional medical personnel are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 50 percent.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The Current Year and the Budget Year increases reflect the updated Title XIX expenditures for both APS and CSBG.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The erosion of savings reflects the updated Title XIX expenditures for both APS and CSBG.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2010-11	2011-12
Total	-\$13,925	-\$13,919
Federal	0	0
State	-6,122	-6,116
County	0	0
Reimbursements	-7,803	-7,803

***This page left intentionally
blank for spacing***

Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project

DESCRIPTION:

On March 31, 2006, the federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) approved the Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project (CAP). The approved waiver allows Title IV-E funds, which are restricted to board and care costs and child welfare services administration, to be used for services and support, to avoid over reliance on out-of-home care, and expeditiously reunify families. The intent of the CAP is to test a "capped allocation" strategy which would block grant a portion of the federal Title IV-E and General Fund (GF) administrative and assistance costs. The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) collaborated with the County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA), and interested counties, to refine a practice and fiscal model which could be implemented under the waiver. The CAP allows up to 20 counties to participate in the five year demonstration project.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2007.

KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Two counties, Los Angeles and Alameda, are participating in the project.
- An annual capped allocation for federal Title IV-E and GF has been established.
- Participating counties are required to provide funding equal to their Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 actual expenditures.
- An annual increase of two percent is added to the federal base allocation for administration and assistance.
- An annual increase of two percent is added to the GF capped allocation for Child Welfare Services (CWS) and Foster Care (FC) Administration.

METHODOLOGY:

- The federal base allocations are based on the county's average Title IV-E actual expenditure claims for administration and assistance submitted for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2003, FFY 2004, and FFY 2005. An annual two percent growth on the federal funds for administration and assistance is provided beginning in FFY 2006.
- The GF base allocation for FC Assistance is capped based on actual expenditures for FY 2005-06.
- The GF base allocations for CWS and FC Administration are based on specified FY 2006-07 allocations. An annual two percent growth above the base allocations is provided beginning in FY 2007-08.
- After the GF base allocations for FC Assistance and CWS Administration are calculated, federal Title XX funds transferred from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant are used in lieu of eligible GF.

Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project

METHODOLOGY (CONTINUED):

- All base allocations for FC Assistance, FC Administration, and CWS Administration are reflected separately in Budget Item 153 with total growth above the base amounts reflected in the Title IV-E Waiver Adjustment line.
- Additional GF is provided above the base for either new premises or premises not included in the base calculations that do not impact caseload and is reflected separately in the Non-Base Premises lines for FC Assistance, FC Administration, and CWS Administration.
- For FC Assistance, the Non-Base Premises 101 line for FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 reflects costs for Dual Agency, the Five Percent Foster Care Rate Increase, the Supplement to the Dual Agency Rate, Educational Stability, and Reassessment Eligibility Relief – AB 1905.
- For FC Administration, the Non-Base Premises 141 line for FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 reflects costs for FC Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) Application and Reassessment Eligibility Relief – AB 1905.
- For CWS Administration, the Non-Base Premises 151 line for FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 reflects costs for *Gomez v. Saenz*; State Family Preservation; Dual Agency Supplement to the Rate; Criminal Record Check for FR; Caregiver Court Filing; Peer Quality Case Reviews; CWS Differential Response, Safety Assessment, and Permanency & Youth Services; CWS Outcome Improvement Project; FC SSI/SSP Application; Safe and Timely Interstate Placement Act of 2006; Personalized Transition Plan; Increase Funding for Caseworker Visits; Chafee Federal National Youth in Transition Database; Increase Family Case Planning; Notification of Relatives; Increase Relative Search and Engagement; Educational Stability; Foster Care Placement and Proximity to School of Origin; and Sibling Placement.
- A ten percent reduction was applied to the Foster Family Agency portion of the Foster Care 101 Base.
- The methodology for the FC 101 – Group Home Rate Increase is located in the Group Home and Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Rate Increase premise.
- The methodology for the CWS 151 – CWS Reduction is located in the CWS Reduction premise.
- The methodology for the FC 101 – American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) – Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) Increase is located in the ARRA- FMAP Increase premise. For more information please see the ARRA premise write up.

FUNDING:

Funding consists of the federal Title IV-E and GF capped allocations along with the required county funding. The FC Assistance base allocation consists of \$16.8 million in Title XX funds that are used in lieu of GF. In addition, the FC 101 Group Home Rate Increase includes 4.6 million in Title XX. The CWS base allocation consists of \$24.2 million in Title XX funds that are used in lieu of GF.

Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project

FUNDING (CONTINUED):

Title IV-E FMAP rate temporarily increased by 6.2 percent effective October 1, 2008, through December 31, 2010. This increase was approved by the federal government to extend until June 30, 2011. This extension of the ARRA results in an increase of 3.2 percent for the third quarter of FY 2010-11 and an increase of 1.2 percent for the fourth quarter of FY 2010-11. Temporary ARRA FMAP increases have been placed under the ARRA premise.

CHANGE FROM MARCH 2011 CONFERENCE BUDGET:

The Current Year GF changes are the result of a decreased caseload for the Educational Stability in FC 101, and additional costs for the Reassessment Eligibility Relief (AB 1905) in FC 101 and FC 141.

REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The Title IV-E Waiver Adjustment reflects an additional year of the two percent growth. The change in FC 101 Non-Base premises is a result of a further decrease in caseload for the Educational Stability premise. The increase in CWS 151 Non-Base premises is primarily a result of an increase in expenditures in the *Gomez v. Saenz* premise, an increase in caseload in the Increase Relative Search and Engagement premise, and an increase in the Chafee Federal National Youth in Transition Database due to an update in the estimate's methodology.

EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's):

	2010-11	2011-12
Item 153 Title IV-E Waiver	Services/Admin And Grants	Services/Admin And Grants
Total	\$1,267,133	\$1,322,252
Federal	534,118	542,934
State	335,359	357,848
County	397,656	421,470
Reimbursements	0	0

Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED): (in 000's):

	2010-11	2011-12
Item 153 IV-E Waiver Adjustment	Services/Admin And Grants	Services/Admin And Grants
Total	\$ 63,631	\$76,626
Federal	48,360	57,344
State	15,271	19,282
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

	2010-11	2011-12
Item 153	Grants	Grants
Foster Care 101 - Base		
Total	\$ 505,933	\$ 505,933
Federal	177,536	177,536
State	121,805	121,805
County	206,592	206,592
Reimbursements	0	0

	2010-11	2011-12
Item 153	Admin.	Admin.
Foster Care 141 - Base		
Total	\$ 38,061	\$ 38,061
Federal	19,845	19,845
State	12,432	12,432
County	5,784	5,784
Reimbursements	0	0

Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED): (in 000's):

	2010-11	2011-12
Item 153	Services/Admin.	Services/Admin.
CWS 151 - Base		
Total	\$ 557,438	\$ 557,438
Federal	244,484	244,484
State	148,678	148,678
County	164,276	164,276
Reimbursements	0	0

	2010-11	2011-12
Item 153	Grants	Grants
Foster Care 101 – Non-Base Premises		
Total	\$9,272	\$9,159
Federal	0	0
State	9,272	9,159
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

	2010-11	2011-12
Item 153	Admin.	Admin.
Foster Care 141 – Non-Base Premises		
Total	\$ 93	\$ 132
Federal	0	0
State	93	132
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED): (in 000's):

	2010-11	2011-12
Item 153	Admin.	Admin.
CWS 151 – Non-Base Premises		
Total	\$32,557	\$33,520
Federal	0	0
State	32,557	33,520
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0
	2010-11	2011-12
Item 153	Grants	Grants
FC 101 – Ten Percent Reduction - FFA		
Total	-\$3,330	-\$3,141
Federal	0	0
State	-3,330	-3,141
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0
	2010-11	2011-12
Item 153	Grants	Grants
FC 101 – Group Home Rate Increase		
Total	\$50,416	\$51,028
Federal	13,628	13,695
State	11,178	11,378
County	25,610	25,955
Reimbursements	0	0

Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's):

Item 153 - FC 101 - ARRA FMAP Impact to the Group Home Rate Increase

	2010-11 Grants	2011-12 Grants
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	1,284	0
State	-514	0
County	-770	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Item 153 - CWS 151 – CWS Reduction

	2010-11 Admin	2011-12 Admin
Total	-\$19,075	-\$19,075
Federal	0	0
State	-19,075	-19,075
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Item – 153 - FC 101 – ARRA FMAP Increase

	2010-11 Grants	2011-12 Grants
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	15,067	0
State	-6,027	0
County	-9,040	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Item – 153 - Carryover from FY 2007-08

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$32,137	\$0
Federal	13,914	0
State	13,019	0
County	5,204	0
Reimbursements	0	0

Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project

EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's):

Item – 153 - Carryover from FY 2008-09

	2010-11	2011-12
Total	\$0	\$72,571
Federal	0	30,030
State	0	23,678
County	0	18,863
Reimbursements	0	0